DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 158 372 95 EA 010 770

AUTHOR	Trusty, Francis M.
TITLE	Strategy Development for Managing Selected Educational Conflicts. A Conceptual Report Related to Conflict and Its Management in the Areas of Student-Student, Student-School, and School-Community Relations.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	20 Mar 78
CONTRACT	NIE-P-77-0206
NOTE	132p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$7.35 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Conflict Resolution; Elementary Secondary Education; Interviews; Problem Solving; School Community Relationship; Student Behavior; Student School Relationship
IDENTIFIERS	*Conflict Management

ABSTRACT

Managing educational conflict has become increasingly more complex. The purpose of this study was to identify three areas of educational conflict and suggest strategies for managing such conflict. These areas are student-student conflict, student-school conflict, and school-community conflict. Data were collected through interviews with people who have specialized knowledge about conflict. The data did not produce formal conclusions but rather is meant to be the point of departure for focused research efforts. Chapter 1 discusses the role and function of conflict in the larger society and in education. Subsequent chapters each introduce an area of conflict and discuss (1) assumptions related to it, (2) forms of undesirable conflict in that area, (3) sources of and reasons for conflict, (4) suggested strategies for handling conflict, and (5) potential effectiveness of the suggested strategies. Strategies for managing student conflict include such techniques as problem-solving, fact-finding, confrontation, and mediation. Strategies for managing student-school conflict include reeducating faculty and administrators, developing strategies to deal with potential conflicts and modifying educational goals and practices. Managing school-community conflicts involves communication, citizen involvement, public meetings, mediators, judicial proceedings, and, in some cases, force. (Author/JM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED158372

STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT FOR MANAGING SELECTED EDUCATIONAL CONFLICTS

A Conceptual Report Related to Conflict and its Management in the Areas of Student-Student, Student-School, and School-Community Relations.

by
Francis M. Trusty, Professor
The University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee

Under Contract with the
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
The National Institute of Education
Contracts and Grants Management Division

for the
School Discipline Studies
of the
Educational Equity Group
Contract No. NIE-P-77-0206

March 20, 1978

EA 010 770

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the contributions of Dr. Charles Achilles from The University of Tennessee, Knoxville and Dr. Robert Simerly from the University of Illinois for their review of the report and their helpful suggestions. Graduate students Donna Moyer, Don Nixon, and Jim Harris, all from The University of Tennessee, gave valuable help in the technical aspect of referencing materials and reviewing applicable portions of typed manuscripts and other reference material. The help and support of staff members of the Bureau of Educational Research and Service in the College of Education was timely and most appreciated. To Phyllis Trusty and Mary Kay Emge for transcribing the tapes and typing the numerous drafts of the report go my sincere thanks. To the many persons who contributed to the report through being interviewed and to those practicing educators who patiently contributed to my efforts to better analyze the data from several different perspectives, I extend my appreciation and thanks. Finally I would like to acknowledge the challenging and helpful comments of Dr. Oliver Moles, NIE project officer.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS i

INTRODUCTION iv

CHAPTER I - CONFLICT IN PERSPECTIVE

Introduction 1

The Functions of Conflict from a Social Perspective. 3

The Role of Student, School, and Community Needs in Educational Conflict 16

The School as a Setting in Which Conflict Takes Place. . . . 28

CHAPTER II - STUDENT-STUDENT CONFLICT

Introduction 31

Assumptions. 31

Forms of Undesirable Student-Student Conflict. 33

Hypotheses About Sources of Student-Student Conflict 42

Strategies for Managing Student-Student Conflicts. 47

Potential Effectiveness of Suggested Strategies for Managing Student-Student Conflict 58

CHAPTER III - STUDENT-SCHOOL CONFLICT

Introduction 63

Assumptions. 63

Forms of Undesirable Student-School Conflict 64

Hypotheses About Sources of Student-School Conflict. 73

Strategies for Managing Student-School Conflicts 76

Potential Effectiveness of Suggested Strategies for Managing Student-School Conflict 81

CHAPTER IV - SCHOOL-COMMUNITY CONFLICT

Introduction 83

Assumptions. 83

Forms of Undesirable School-Community Conflict 84

Hypotheses About Sources of School-Community Conflict. . . . 88

Strategies for Managing School-Community Conflicts 93

Potential Effectiveness of Suggested Strategies for Managing School-Community Conflict 98

CHAPTER V - SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS. 100

BIBLIOGRAPHY 109

APPENDIX A 116

INTRODUCTION

The identification of conflict, specifically student-student, student-school, and school-community conflict, and how to manage it more effectively is the focus of this report. Such conflict has been an integral part of education for decades. Its management, however, is an increasingly complex problem and one which requires greater understanding and an increased commitment of time and resources. A primary purpose of this study was to identify the kinds of undesirable conflict in which students, schools, and communities are engaged and to suggest strategies for more effectively managing those conflicts.

Data used in the study were earlier collected by the principal investigator through interviewing persons in the fields of sociology, economics, psychiatry, education, law, political science, and labor management relations about their perceptions of conflict and its management, broadly speaking. Persons interviewed were not selected for their knowledge of student, school, and community conflict. They were, however, perceived as having potential knowledge about conflict and its management from the perspective of an insightful participant, a third party responsible for managing conflict, or as one who has attempted to conceptualize conflict and its management.

The collection of data was supported by the University of Tennessee and a Danforth Foundation-National Academy of School

Executives fellowship. Other reference materials available through the University of Tennessee Library system, including a limited ERIC search of unpublished materials, were also reviewed. The investigator's own professional experiences and contact with administrators, teachers, and citizens in numerous school systems provided a third source of information for the study.

Transcribed interviews were analyzed to identify references to the causes, strategies, and goals of conflict which might be applicable to student-student, student-school, and school-community conflict. Each transcribed interview was briefly summarized by the principal investigator for use in developing hypotheses and strategies related to student-student, student-school, and school-community conflict and its management. The transcribed interviews were also studied to identify the potential effectiveness of strategies suggested for managing student-student, student-school, and school-community conflict.

Published materials were reviewed to identify the social role and function of conflict, the needs which affect student, school, and community relationships, and strategies for managing conflicts.

Interview data and published materials were reviewed by the principal investigator for their apparent functional relationship to the types of conflict being studied. The principal investigator's first-hand knowledge and understanding gained from 30 years professional experience as a public school and university teacher, administrator, researcher, and educational consultant served to focus the review around questions such as (1) Does the information describe the conflicts which exist among students, schools, and communities. (2) Can the information or ideas presented help better understand the conflicts which exist among students, schools, and communities, and (3) Can the information or ideas be efficiently and effectively translated into statements or principles related to student, school, and community conflict and its management?

The situational nature of each interview and the diversity of viewpoints expressed by persons interviewed as well as those expressed in published material hampered efforts to compare and precluded efforts to quantify or to count responses as a means of drawing conclusions from the data. Efforts focused instead, on drawing out from the transcribed interviews those ideas which could be functionally related to student, school, and community conflict.

Direct quotes from taped interviews were not included because the original understanding with respondents precluded that option. The exploratory nature of the interviews also tended to preclude the selection of brief "in-context" applicable quotes.

The investigator attempted to maintain the integrity of the material even as efforts were made to relate observations of the interviewees to other written materials and to the investigator's own insights gained from daily contact with practicing teachers and administrators. This effort to relate ideas, observations, and experiences involved identifying basic individual and organizational needs, studying common patterns of interaction, using heuristic constructs to classify the strategies used by participants and evaluating strategy effectiveness using criteria evolved from discussions with administrators, teachers, students, colleagues, and interviewees.

Throughout the preparation of this report the investigator discussed the emerging ideas with selected students, professional colleagues, and with school administrators attending conflict seminars conducted by the investigator for agencies such as the National Academy of School Executives, the Tennessee State Department of Education, the Alabama School Administrators Association, the Indiana School Administrators Association, and the Indiana School Boards Association. The resulting synthesis of ideas are reflected in the assumptions made, the conflicts identified, the hypotheses generated, the strategies suggested and the assessment of their potential effectiveness. Because of the nature of this study, the stated hypotheses and strategies should be viewed as a point of departure for focused research efforts. Refinement of these hypotheses and strategies will depend on the development of more specific and focused questionnaires, and interviewing selected respondents functionally aware of the social, psychological, and cultural dimensions in which student-student, student-school, and school-community conflict occurs.

Chapter I of this report explores the role and function of conflict through directing attention to: (1) the functions of conflict from a social perspective, (2) the role of student, school, and community needs in educational conflict, and (3) the school as a setting in which conflict takes place. Conflict is viewed in a broader social context as a way of better understanding school-related conflicts in which individuals, schools, and communities strive to meet their needs and others' expectations.

The conflicts explored in the study are presented in three chapters. Chapter II reports on student-student conflict. Chapter III focuses on student-school conflict, and Chapter IV relates to school-community conflict. Each chapter introduces the area of conflict studied and discusses (1) the assumptions made related to that type of conflict, (2) the forms of undesirable conflict which were identified, (3) the hypotheses generated about the sources of conflict including supporting information and reasons for the occurrence of each conflict, (4) the suggested strategies for handling the conflicts identified, and (5) the potential effectiveness of suggested strategies.

A brief summary of the findings and conclusions are presented in Chapter V, followed by a bibliography of selected references. A list of persons interviewed is contained in Appendix A.

CHAPTER I

CONFLICT IN PERSPECTIVE

Introduction

Conflict is an integral part of life in America. In the public sector, conflict permeates many areas including labor management relations, taxpayer-government activities, the conduct of public officials, the selective enforcement of laws, the development and use of natural resources, the focus of television programs, equal rights for women and minorities, the role and function of public bodies and institutions, the education of children, and the election of public officials. In the private sector, conflict manifests itself in family disputes, divorce, the impact of drugs on individuals, child abuse, a lack of self-respect, a sense of hopelessness and despair experienced by many capable people, turned-off and dropped-out youth, and personal acts of crime.

Efforts to improve the quality of public education available to students depend on the congruent expectations of students, school personnel, and community members. The multiplicity of values and the diversity of cultures have made that task more difficult. The resulting conflict has increasingly inhibited the ability of schools to provide quality education. Student-student, student-school, and school-community conflict lessens the community's willingness to support the school financially, socially, and psychologically, and to grant it access to needed human resources. Failure of students and school personnel to agree on the role of students, teachers, and administrators, has hindered instructional efforts. Disagreement on policies, procedures, and implementation practices has focused attention on points of controversy and, thus far, has tended to reduce the development of mutual goals and the commitment of resources to achieve these goals. Mixed messages from influential segments of the community to responsive members of the faculty and administration have led to polarization of views in such areas as program changes, disciplinary procedures, and instructional services. The inability of administrators and teachers to reconcile the issues of authority, control, decision-making, allocation of resources, and the treatment of students is leading to collective bargaining or professional negotiation procedures. These processes, however, tend to focus on the distribution of economic resources to the faculty and the establishment of grievance procedures with less attention subsequently being given to student needs, educational programming, and school-community problems. Conflict between students and schools is resulting in a high drop-out rate of students through student withdrawals, suspensions, and expulsions. Vandalism and an increase in student use of adult militant tactics are concerns in most school systems.

It is out of this maelstrom that a need emerges for schools to better understand student-student conflict, student-school conflict, and school-community conflict. There is a need to identify the various forms of conflict in these areas. What are the reasons for the continuing conflict? What aspects of these conflicts can be managed more effectively? What strategies are most apt to reduce undesirable forms of conflict in each of these areas?

The Functions of Conflict from a Social Perspective

Educational conflict such as student-student conflict, student-school conflict, and school-community conflict is an extension of the conflict which exists in society. As such, it must be examined and understood in that context.[1] The causes of such conflict are irretrievably embedded in the individual's struggle for a sense of identity and acceptance within the cultural norms, myths, and preferences of his society.[2] The form these educational conflicts take is similar to the form other conflict takes at various levels within the social, economic, political, and religious divisions of American society. The strategies used in managing undesirable educational conflicts are also consistent with the patterns of conflict management established in other segments of the society.

---

[1] This view is discussed in Harold Full, Controversy in American Education: An Anthology of Crucial Issues (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1967).

[2] For a more complete discussion of this point of view, see Morris L. West, "The Struggle For Identity" in Stewart Mudd (Ed.) Conflict Resolution and World Education (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1967); William Glasser, The Identity Society (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1972); Erik H. Erikson, Youth, Change and Challenge (New York: Basic Books Publishing Co., Inc., 1963); and Talcott Parsons, "Social Classes and the Class Conflict," American Economic Review, 39 (May, 1959), pp. 16-26.

The beliefs people hold about conflict as to its functional or pathological characteristics are developed in the writings and thinking of many organizational and social theorists. These include writers such as Parsons,[3] Lewin,[4] Warner,[5] Roethlisberger,[6] and Boulding[7] who reflect a view of conflict as a disruptive, if not a pathological force in human affairs. Other writers such as Simmel,[8] Coser,[9] Dahrendorf,[10] Lenski,[11]

---

[3] Talcott Parsons, "Some Comments on the Sociology of Karl Marx," Sociological Theory and Modern Society (New York: Free Press, 1967), pp. 102-35; Structure and Process in Modern Society (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1960); and The Structure of Social Action (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1949).

[4] Kurt Lewin, Resolving Social Conflicts (New York: Harper Bros., 1958), p. 163.

[5] W. Lloyd Warner and Associates, Democracy in Jonesville (New York: Harper Bros., 1949), Chapter 16.

[6] F. J. Roethlisberger, Management and Morale (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1941), p. 112.

[7] Kenneth E. Boulding, "Non-Dialectical Patterns in History," A Primer on Social Dynamics: History of Dialectics and Development (New York: The Free Press, 1970), pp. 54-74.

[8] Georg Simmel, Conflict and the Web of Group Affiliation (Glencoe: Free Press, 1955), pp. 11-123. Translation by Kurt H. Wolff.

[9] Lewis A. Coser, The Functions of Social Conflict (Glencoe: Free Press, 1956).

[10] Ralf Dahrendorf, Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1959).

[11] Gerhard E. Lenski, Human Societies: A Macrolevel Introduction to Sociology (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970), pp. 32-34.

Horowitz,[12] Mills,[13] Sumner,[14] and Oberschall[15] support a view of conflict as essentially a functional and constructive force. Oberschall,[16] in tracing the development of conflict, social movements, and collective behavior observes:

> The foundations of present-day theories of group conflict, collective behavior, and social movement were laid by the eighteenth-century philosophes and moral philosophers, by the late nineteenth-century French social scientists, social Darwinists, and historians who specialized in the French Revolution and the history of the socialist and labor movements.

In a later statement, Oberschall[17] notes, "For the theory of group conflict and collective behavior, these several legacies of the Enlightenment lead to divergent points of view."

Duke[18] compares Parsons' and Dahrendorf's divergent views of the function of conflict under the headings of Integration Theory and Conflict Theory, respectively. Presented as propositions, Integration Theory states:

---

[12] Irving L. Horowitz, "Consensus, Conflict and Cooperation: A Sociological Inventory," Social Forces, 41 (Dec. 1962), pp. 177-88.

[13] C. Wright Mills, The Sociological Imagination (New York: Grove, 1959).

[14] William Graham Sumner, Folkways (New York: Mentor, 1960), p. 32.

[15] Anthony Oberschall, Social Conflict and Social Movements (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973).

[16] Ibid., p. 1.

[17] Ibid., p. 10.

[18] James T. Duke, Conflict and Power in Social Life (Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University Press, 1976), p. 155.

1. Every society is a relatively persisting configuration of its elements.
2. Every society is a well-integrated configuration of elements.
3. Every element in a society contributes to its functioning.
4. Every society rests on the consensus of its members.

Similarly, the propositions of Conflict Theory include:

1. Every society is subjected at every moment to change: social change is ubiquitous.
2. Every society experiences at every moment social conflict: social conflict is ubiquitous.
3. Every element in a society contributes to its change.
4. Every society rests on constraint of some of its members by others.

Duke,[19] in elaborating on these views, states, ". . . that one of the crucial differences separating conflict theories from integration theories is the relative emphasis placed upon stability or change," and[20] ". . . conflict theorists and integration theorists not only start with different background assumptions, they also start with different values."

In discussing the question of value differences, Duke[21] suggests that,

> A synthesis of the two theoretical orientations is feasible at the level of both theory and data, but is much less likely at the value level. We would expect, therefore, that even as the two theories tend to come together after a decade of bitter polarization, that the proponents of each will remain apart on questions of values and policies.

---

[19] Ibid., p. 158.

[20] Ibid., p. 225.

[21] Ibid.

Efforts to reconcile the divergent points of view with a view towards developing more effective conflict management strategies increasingly appears possible, however. Duke[22] notes that,

> . . . a substantial shift in group perception and definition of the situation has taken place. Sociologists and nonsociologists alike are much more likely to 'see' conspiracy, conflict, and power in much of social life. This revolutionary and, we believe, paradigmatic change in the manner of viewing social life has brought greater attention to the conflict orientation of sociology and has tended to 'normalize' it.

Boulding,[23] an economist, discusses the role of conflict using a dialectical and non-dialectical frame of reference. He defines a dialectical philosophy as consisting of ". . . all those ideologies which regard conflict as the essential process in development and therefore tend to put a high intrinsic value on conflict, struggle, war, and revolution." He places a positive value on an integrative system which is ". . . the dynamic process by which human beings come to acquire love, respect, status, identity, identification, and so on. . ." He relates these two processes by stating that, "On the whole, I am inclined to regard these dialectical elements in the integrative system as symptoms of disease rather than of health." He further suggests, "If psychoanalysis has taught us anything, it is that the dialectical processes in the family and especially between parents and children are most destructive to the integrative system." In an economic context, Boulding argues that dialectical processes represent costs, not revenues, and that they represent hindrances rather than a help to the growth of science and knowledge.

---

[22] Ibid., p. 227.

[23] Boulding, op. cit., pp. 60-74.

Boulding distinguishes, however, between the relevancy of dialectical processes for individuals and societies as against the historical processes of mankind. He admits to their relevancy in the former and questions their contribution to the latter.

Lewin,[24] a prominant social psychologist, has also contributed important thoughts to the field of conflict management. His thinking regarding the role of conflict appears to have changed from support of conflict-oriented activity to gain desirable goals and objectives to a posture of avoiding conflict when possible. Lewin's thinking has influenced not only former students, but the Human Relations Movement reflected in workshops conducted by the National Training Laboratories at Bethel, Maine.

Roethlisberger,[25] an early advocate of participative management styles, conducted research, the impact of which was to determine ways of avoiding conflict between management and workers; to achieve industrial peace through non-confrontative processes. He states, "How can a comfortable working equilibrium be maintained between the various social groups in an industrial enterprise such that no one group in the organization will separate itself out in opposition to the remainder?" The values reflected are similar to those of Rogers,[26] McGregor,[27] Likert,[28] and numerous other writers.

---

[24] See Lewin, Resolving Social Conflicts, op. cit.; and Lewin, "Action Research and Minority Problems," Journal of Social Issues, II (1946), pp. 34-36.

[25] Roethlisberger, op. cit., p. 112.

Warner's[29] studies related to social class also view conflict as a disruptive phenomenon. His studies, which focused on an analysis of classes of people within a community based on similar social positions, tend to ignore the power differentials which existed. Community equilibrium was viewed as an ideal state. Situations and events which made for lack of harmony and integration were viewed negatively.

Dahrendorf,[30] reflecting an opposing conflict theory point of view states,

---

[26] C.R. Rogers and F.J. Roethlisberger, "Barriers and Gateways to Communication," Harvard Business Review, 30 (1952), pp. 46-52.

[27] D. McGregor, "The Human Side of Enterprise," in W.G. Bennis, K.D. Benne and R. Chin, The Planning of Change (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969), pp. 422-31.

[28] R. Likert, New Patterns of Management (New York: McGraw-Hill and Company, 1961).

[29] Warner and Associates, op. cit.; and W. Lloyd Warner and J.O. Low, The Social System of the Modern Factory (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1947).

[30] Ralf Dahrendorf, "Out of Utopia: Toward a Reorientation of Sociological Analysis," American Journal of Sociology, 64 (September, 1958), pp. 125-26.

> The great creative force that leads to change in (society) . . . is social conflict. The notion that wherever there is social life, there is conflict may be unpleasant and disturbing. Nevertheless, it is indispensable to our understanding of social problems . . . Not the presence but the absence of conflict is surprising and abnormal, and we have good reason to be suspicious if we find a society or social organization that displays no evidence of conflict . . . societies and social organizations are held together not by consensus but by constraint, not by universal agreement, but by the coercion of some by others . . . .

Coser,[31] an astute interpreter of the writings of Simmel and other conflict theorists, identified 16 propositions which support the theme of conflict as a productive force within and among groups as they associate and carry on their natural functions even as he decries the lack of attention paid by sociologists to this vital area.

Mills,[32] criticism of Parson's emphasis upon the integrative aspects of life and his rejection of the functional aspects of conflict was an important point in the emerging dialogue between the two points of view.

Oberschall[33] states,

> Social conflict, opposition movements, social disturbances, as has been shown repeatedly in these pages, are a result of processes of social change, but they are also one of the usual ways in which change is brought about. Conflict overcomes the basically conservative tendencies in the social order; it prevents the ossification of institutions and builds pressures for responsiveness and innovation. During mobilization and confrontation, new leaders, organizations, ideas, and programs emerge and grow.

---

[31] Coser, op. cit.

[32] Mills, op. cit., pp. 25-49.

[33] Oberschall, op. cit., p. 344.

The views of these writers are reflected in the day-to-day behaviors of people in business, industrial, educational, religious, and governmental organizations. Their opposing points of view about the role and function of conflict are reflected in strategies for managing the conflicts which do exist. The theme of conflict as an unproductive force in American life, although a dominant view, has been balanced by the less well-publicized role of conflict as a means of bringing about healthy changes and growth in people and organizations. Although conflict often has been seen as a dysfunctional force, the prevailing practice has been to utilize conflict and adversary relationships in important segments of our society. Many of our national leaders have managed racial, economic, social, environmental, and political conflicts using adversary proceedings and have relied on a win-lose philosophy. In one area, that of labor management relations, business, industrial, and labor leaders have demonstrated their propensity for adversary relationships.

The financial support of highly competitive win-lose athletic contests by business and higher education institutions provide further visible evidence of a conflict-oriented philosophy. Further support for this conclusion can be seen in the response of political and educational leaders to the civil rights movement, including the sit-ins, the voter registration drives, the freedom marches, and the Supreme Court decisions[34] related to racial desegregation of the schools, and to the student demands at major universities such as Columbia, NYU, Wisconsin, Kent State, and the University of California at Berkeley, for freedom of speech, student involvement in decision making, and student rights. These and other conflicts were all highly visible and well-publicized examples of the impact of prevailing social-cultural norms on the management of conflict. These have not gone unnoticed by public school administrators in dealing with student-student, student-school, and school-community conflicts of lesser magnitude.

---

[34] Brown, et al. v. Board of Education of Topeka, 347 U.S. 483.; Taylor v. Board of Education of New Rochelle, 191 F. SEPP. 181 (S.D.N.Y. 1961), 6 Race rel.L.rep.90 (1961).; Serrano v. Priest, 5 Cal.3D584, 96 Cal. RPTR, 601, 487 PP. 2D 1241 (1971).

Students, teachers, administrators, parents, taxpayers, and American citizens in general are a product of this competition-oriented society. Their thinking, feelings, and behavior related to educational conflict have been shaped by contact with the culture. Indeed, much of the historical interaction among and between groups of people continues to govern everyday conflict management processes.

Business, industrial, military, and governmental organizations often function in a framework of perceived scarcity, are organized for the production of material goods and/or the delivery of "pre-packaged" services, and are structured as bureaucratic hierarchies. They often exhibit authoritarian behavior and maintain centralized control mechanisms. As adult socializing agencies, they influence employee attitudes about issues such as the function of education and how to manage the conflicts which arise.

For generations, the role of American public schools has been to induct younger members of the society into a predominant social order. Standardized curricula, emphasis upon rote learning, an obsession with the need for conformity and elimination of differences, and rigidly enforced disciplinary procedures all attest to the perceived function of the American school system.

Whitehead[35] in numerous eloquent presentations suggested that education should involve not only the acquisition of knowledge, but its application and use. He decried the logic of separating the subject matter to be learned into distinct disciplines such as algebra, geometry, science, and history. Simultaneously, however, he supported a process of education that has long characterized the American public school. He stated,[36]

> The difficulty is just this: the apprehension of general ideas, intellectual habits of mind, and pleasurable interests in mental achievement can be evoked by no form of words, however accurately adjusted. All practical teachers know that education is a patient process of the mastery of details, minute by minute, hour by hour, day by day. There is no royal road to learning through an airy path of brilliant generalizations. There is a proverb about the difficulty of seeing the wood because of the trees. That difficulty is exactly the point in which I am enforcing. The problem of education is to make the people see the wood by means of the trees.

It is this "process of the mastery of details" which has long characterized the role and function of American public education. In the early 1950's Robert Hutchins,[37] a strong supporter of the traditional concept of a liberal education, advanced a doctrine in support of education based on improving the rational, moral, and spiritual powers of men through the use of a liberal education and Socratic dialogue.

---

[35] Alfred North Whitehead, The Aims of Education: and Other Essays (New York: Free Press, 1967).

[36] Ibid., p. 18.

[37] Robert M. Hutchins, The Conflict in Education in Democratic Societies (New York: Harper Bros., 1953).

Numerous attempts have been made, often without success, to modify and change this "process". The works of John Dewey,[38] the writings of Silberman,[39] the astute observations of Bruner,[40] the fictional but "true to life" inside account by Kaufman,[41] and the thought-provoking comments by John Holt[42] are representative of the criticisms of the rigid role of public education in America. And yet, as Bruner[43] states,

> Education has been conceived as a means to better the lot of our children rather than our own lot; it is almost a universal belief that children should have a better educational opportunity than their parents. Yet for all our reverence for education, we have paid little enough attention to its content: a vague reference to the 'three R's' has seemed sufficient. We have been a country in which doing has been taken as the mark of effectiveness in thinking . . . .

Education has been shaped, however, by external events such as Sputnik, the development of world-wide satellite communications, the emergence of the third world as an economic and political force, the increasing affluence of the American public, and the desire for fulfillment of the American dream of equality and educational enlightenment. These events have contributed to the conflict between supporters of traditional academic induction processes and supporters of an education based on the needs of individual students. Recognition of the rights of racial, ethnic, and religious minorities to have a voice in educational policy development and implementation has led to an increase in daily confrontations in school systems. Schools now, however, have started to become aware of conflict as an integral aspect of student-student, student-school, and school-community relations.

---

[38] John Dewey, The Child and the Curriculum (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956).

[39] Charles E. Silberman, Crisis in the Classroom: The Remaking of American Education (New York: Random House, 1970).

[40] Jerome S. Bruner, The Process of Education (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960).

[41] Bel Kaufman, Up The Down Staircase (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1965).

[42] John Holt, How Children Fail (New York: Pitman, 1964).

[43] Bruner, op. cit., pp. 73-74.

The efforts of schools to fulfill their traditional function and at the same time provide higher quality individualized education are at the heart of much student-student, student-school and school-community conflict. The social, cultural, psychological, economic, and emotional needs of students increase dramatically while the ability of schools and school districts to make needed changes proceeds at a snail's pace. The question of whether there is conflict among and between students, schools, and communities is no longer a moot question. There is conflict and most astute observers of the educational scene will readily admit that it is pervasive and in all probability will increase in the years ahead. There is a need to better understand the causes of such conflict, to differentiate between desirable and undesirable forms of conflict, and to manage more effectively the undesirable conflicts which occur.

The Role of Student, School, and Community Needs in Educational Conflict

Educational conflict involving students, schools, and communities primarily relates to differences in expectations, frustrations resulting from unfulfilled needs, and a perception that the time necessary for rectifying the perceived inequalities and injustices is limited. Hence, considerable conflict is brought about by persons with unmet needs using highly visible, sometimes abrasive, strategies for the purpose of getting their needs met more quickly. The use of coercive strategies by highly visible adult leaders tends to legitimize the use of such strategies by students.

Student Needs. Many authorities in the field of human growth and development including Maslow,[44] Erikson,[45] Glasser,[46] Rogers,[47] and Keniston[48] have discussed the needs and behavior of human beings.

---

[44] A.H. Maslow, "A Theory of Human Motivation," Psychological Review 50 (July 1943): pp. 370-96.

[45] Erik H. Erikson, "Eight Ages of Man," Childhood and Society (New York: W.W. Norton and Co., Inc., 2nd ed., 1964).

[46] Glasser, The Identity Society, op. cit.; and William Glasser, Schools Without Failure (New York: Harper & Row, 1967).

[47] Carl R. Rogers, On Becoming A Person: A Therapist's View of Psychotherapy (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1961); also Carl R. Rogers, "Toward a Modern Approach to Values: The Valuing Process in the Mature Person," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 68 (February 1964), pp. 160-67; and Carl R. Rogers, Freedom to Learn (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1969).

[48] Kenneth Keniston, The Uncommitted: Alienated Youth in American Society (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1965).

A brief summarization of thoughts from these selected authors will suffice here to establish the general nature of student needs and their relation to educational conflict.

The importance of early learning experiences to children's intellectual development is underscored by Piaget.[49] His six stages of intellectual development include: "The Use of Reflexes"; "The First Acquired Adaptations and the Primary Circular Reaction"; The 'Secondary Circular Reactions,' and the Procedures Destined to Make Interesting Sights Last"; "The Coordination of the Secondary Schemata and Their Application to New Situations"; "The 'Tertiary Circular Reaction' and the 'Discovery of New Means Through Active Experimentation'"; and "The Invention of New Means Through Mental Combinations." He states,[50] "In short, at every level, experience is necessary to the development of intelligence." Further,[51] ". . . the importance of experience augments rather than diminishes in the course of the six stages we have singled out."

Maslow[52] suggests that all people have basic physiological, safety, love, esteem, and self-actualization needs. These needs serve to focus an individual's behavior. High need deficiencies can and often do lead to undesirable conflict. However, when people's basic needs are met, they then strive to fulfill higher needs related to self-actualization.

---

[49] Jean Piaget, The Origins of Intelligence in Children, Translated by Margaret Cook (New York: W.W. Norton and Co., Inc.,) 1963.

[50] Ibid., p. 362.

[51] Ibid., p. 363.

[52] Maslow, op. cit., pp. 370-96.

Students, more than most adults, lack the resources, skills, legal status, knowledge, and understanding needed to provide for their own basic needs. This, however, does not lessen their striving to fulfill those needs or to control their own development.

The importance of an individual having a sense of self-esteem and being held in high regard by others is emphasized in Maslow's writings. The lack of such self-esteem tends to produce feelings of inferiority, weakness, and helplessness. This, in turn, leads to basic discouragement, compensatory or neurotic trends and can lead to severe traumatic neurosis.

Maslow[53] states, "In our society, the thwarting of these needs (love, affection, belongingness) is the most commonly found core in cases of maladjustment and more severe psychopathology," and ". . . practically all theorists of psychopathology have stressed thwarting of the love needs as basic in the picture of maladjustments."

Erikson[54] identifies the needs of school-age children as related to fidelity, diversity, locomotion, skillfulness, and ego identity. The means by which these needs are fulfilled vary among individuals and groups. However, they frequently focus on activities that seem idealistic, rebellious, deviant, conformist, impractical, loyal and/or spontaneous. In most instances there is a demand for recognition, for acceptance, and a search for what is real. Erikson states,[55]

---

[53] Maslow, op. cit., p. 381.

[54] Erik H. Erikson, "Youth: Fidelity and Diversity," in Stuart Mudd (Ed.), Conflict Resolution and World Education (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1967), pp. 39-57; and Erik H. Erikson, Identity, Youth and Crisis (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1968).

> The most widespread expression of the discontented search of youth is the craving for locomotion, whether expressed in a general 'being on the go,' 'tearing after something,' or 'running around'; or in locomotion proper as in vigorous work, in absorbing sports, in rapt dancing . . .

Their need for locomotion ". . . also finds expression through participation in the movements of the day . . . ." He further states,[56]

> The evidence in young lives of the search for something and somebody to be true to is seen in a variety of pursuits more or less sanctioned by society. It is often hidden in a bewildering combination of shifting devotion and sudden perversity, . . .

and further,

> . . . youth . . . must often test extremes before setting on a considered course. These extremes, particularly in times of ideological confusion and widespread marginality of identity, may include not only rebellious, but also deviant, delinquent, and self-destructive tendencies.

Finally, Erikson[57] states,

> The dominant issues of this, as of any other stage, therefore is that of the active, the selective, ego being in charge and being enabled to be in charge by a social structure which grants a given age group the place it needs - and in which it is needed.

---

[55] Erikson, "Youth: Fidelity and Diversity," op. cit., pp. 45-46.

[56] Ibid., p. 41.

[57] Ibid., p. 47.

Glasser[58] identifies the basic needs of all people as being a relationship with a caring person, the need to love and be loved, the need to feel a sense of worth to self and others. He identifies the acceptance of responsibility and involvement as critical issues in the satisfaction of these needs. Glasser[59] states,

> Acquiring responsibility is a complicated life-long problem. Although we are given unchanging needs from birth to death, needs which, if left unsatisfied, cause us or others to suffer, we are not naturally endowed with the ability to fulfill them. If the ability to fulfill our needs were as much a part of man as are the needs themselves, there would be no psychiatric problems. This ability must, however, be learned.

Glasser[60] further suggests that changes have taken place in the priorities people associate with life and living. The primary need now expressed by individuals is to acquire an identity or role through which personal and vocational fulfillment is achieved. He states, "Almost everyone is personally engaged in a search for acceptance as a person rather than as a performer of a task."

Rogers[61] has long been a student of the process by which an individual becomes alienated from himself and subsequently from his society. His insights provide important clues to the source of conflict experienced by individuals. He states,[62]

---

[58] William Glasser, Reality Therapy: A New Approach to Psychiatry (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1965), pp. 5-41.

[59] Ibid., p. 14

[60] Glasser, The Identity Society, op. cit.

[61] Rogers, Freedom To Learn, op. cit.

[62] Rogers, Freedom To Learn, op. cit., p. 247.

> I believe that this picture of the individual, with values mostly interjective, held as fixed concepts, rarely examined or tested, is the picture of most of us. By taking over the conceptions of others as our own, we lose contact with the potential wisdom of our own functioning and lose confidence in ourselves. Since these value constructs are often sharply at variance with what is going on in our own experiencing, we have in a very basic way divorced ourselves from ourselves, and this accounts for much of modern strain and insecurity. This fundamental discrepancy between the individual's concepts and what he is actually experiencing, between the intellectual structure of his values and the valuing process going on unrecognized within him - this is a part of the fundamental estrangement of modern man from himself. This is a major problem for the therapist.

Some of the interjected patterns which provide the dilemmas out of which conflict emerges are identified by Rogers[63] as

> Sexual desires and behaviors are mostly bad. The sources of this construct are many - parents, church, teachers; Disobedience is bad. Here parents and teachers combine with the military to emphasize this concept. To obey is good. To obey without question is even better; Making money is the highest good. The sources of this conceived value are too numerous to mention; Learning an accumulation of scholarly facts is highly desirable; Browsing and aimless exploratory reading for fun is undesirable. The source of these last two concepts is apt to be the school, the educational system; Abstract art is good. Here the people we regard as sophisticated are originators of the value; Communism is utterly bad. Here the government is a major source; To love thy neighbor is the highest good. This concept comes from the church, perhaps from the parents; Cooperation and teamwork are preferable to acting alone. Your companions are an important source; Cheating is clever and desirable. The peer group again is the origin; Coca-Colas, chewing gum, electric refrigerators, color TV and automobiles are all utterly desirable. This conception comes not only from advertisement, but is reinforced by people all over the world. From Jamaica to Japan, from Copenhagen to Kowloon, the Coca-Cola culture has come to be regarded as the acme of desirability.

---

[63] Rogers, Freedom To Learn, op. cit., p. 245.

Keniston[64] explores the pressures which youth must face in their environment and the impact of those pressures upon students. He states,

> I have maintained that all societies make demands on their members, defining social virtues to coincide with the social demands and shaping the young so that as adults they can comply with what society asks. Furthermore, I have maintained that in every functioning social order, there is always a 'social myth,' a set of interpretations of reality, experience, and virtue which may be more or less adequate to social or human needs. Out of the vast range of human potentials, the myth selects certain potentials as primary and others as unimportant, certain aspects of experience as most real, certain human qualities as most virtuous. Every community, therefore, stresses some demands at the expense of others, making especially heavy demands in some areas, pushing men hardest there. Given the vast variability of inborn constitution, the inevitable vagaries of child-rearing and the accidents of life, every society will inevitably produce some men and women who are misfits or malcontents.

The misfits produced by established social processes include alienated students. Keniston[65] describes the characteristics of the alienated student as follows:

> They suffer from what the psychoanalyst, Erik Erikson, has called 'identity diffusion' - from an intense feeling of the precariousness and disunity of the self from doubt about their own continuing capacity to 'cope,' coupled with a relentless search for some trustworthy foundation for selfhood. Their use of intellect is in the service of this quest for understanding and meaning for the sake of ultimate selfhood. Their dissatisfaction with their education is co-extensive with an inability to find in college any solid sense of who they are and where they stand. The search for identity pervades their wandering, their seeking some renewing contact with Things, their simultaneous refusal of the identity of a 'beatnik' and their need to define themselves as 'one who opposes.' And in their fear of being overwhelmed by their own admiration, in their scorning both for those who resemble them and for

---

[64] Keniston, op. cit., p. 414.

[65] Ibid., p. 102.

> those who are different, in the wariness and distrustfulness with which they approach reciprocity and intimacy of any kind - in all these we can infer the same fragility of self.
>
> Strong in opposition, these young men are weak in affirmation; unable to articulate or even to know what they stand for, they have little sense of self to stand on. For the achievement of identity requires in every young man and woman an implicit set of goals and standards - usually those provided by society - which tell him who he is, where he stands, whence he comes, and whither he goes.

As the legitimacy of student needs are recognized and as students strive to fulfill personal needs during their formative years, the groundwork is being laid for conflict. When the means for fulfilling these needs are in short supply and the demand great, there will be competition and conflict. As the means for fulfilling these needs, whether psychologically, emotionally, materialistically, or economically become plentiful and are so recognized, competition is apt to be less and conflict more manageable. The ability to differentiate between scarce and plentiful resources in educational settings is, therefore, a critical issue in the management of student-related conflicts. Developing an educational program that maximizes the opportunities for students to fulfill their needs, to acquire a satisfactory identity, and to develop the skills essential for future social, economic, and political survival and growth are also essential to minimizing undesirable student-related conflict.

School Needs. Schools have been legitimized by our culture to perform a number of functions. Numerous commission reports, legislative enactments, local school board policies, judicial decisions, and professional pronouncements have served to clarify those functions.[66] In the past, schools have educated citizens to accept prevailing social norms, the competitive private enterprise economic system, a work-centered ethic, traditional values emphasizing basic literacy, the importance of attending college, and the predetermined roles in American society. Further, the organization of schools has closely paralleled the structure developed in business, industry, government, and the military. In keeping with this alliance, schools' current programs have grown out of the need to fulfill the expectations of these dominant Americans. The success of the schools' program was frequently measured at the ballot box on tax and bond referendums, by the percentage of students receiving academic scholarships to good universities, by the quality of the athletic program in terms of wins and losses, and by the absence of controversy.

Schools have often defined their internal needs as related to providing a stable environment in which learning could take place insuring conformity of behavior among students, having students demonstrate satisfactory academic achievement, and providing well-controlled and orchestrated outlets for students' emotions and youthful exuberances. Erikson[67] states,

---

[66] For further elaboration, review the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education Report of 1918 (the seven "cardinal principals" of education) and the Educational Policies Commission Reports of 1938 (The Purposes of Education in American Democracy); 1948 (Education for All American Children); 1952 (Education for All American Youth: A Forward Look); 1959 (An Essay on Quality in Public Education); and 1961 (The Central Purpose of American Education). Other helpful documents include the legal decisions leading up to and including Brown, et al. v. Board of Education of Topeka, 347 U.S. 483, The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, especially Titles I, II and III.

> It is clear that societies offer any number of ritual combinations of ideological perspective and vigorous movement (dance, sports, parades, demonstrations, riots) to harness youth in the service of their historical aims; and that where societies fail to do so, these patterns will seek their own combinations, in small groups occupied with serious games, good-natured foolishness, cruel prankishness, and delinquent warfare.

Schools have taken on the characteristics of bureaucracies. As such they have needs which must be met if they are to be effective. Selznick[68] identifies five needs which appear applicable. They are: (1) the security of the organization as a whole in relation to social forces in its environment; (2) the stability of the lines of authority in communication; (3) the stability of informal relations within the organization; (4) the continuity of policy and the sources of its determination; and (5) a homogeneity of outlook with respect to the meaning and role of the organization.

It would also appear that a school's needs relate to efficiency and effectiveness in planning, organizing, providing leadership, making decisions, curriculum development and implementation, establishing a positive learning environment, evaluating personnel and programs, coordinating, instructing, and the budgeting and expenditure of funds.

---

[67] Erikson, "Youth: Fidelity and Diversity," op. cit., p. 46.

[68] Phillip Selznick, "Foundations of the Theory of Organizations," American Sociological Review, 13 (February 1948), pp. 25-35.

However, the changing demands of an increasingly diverse student population coupled with an eroding financial base, in many instances based on value shifts in the society, have led to educational confusion.

The traditional classroom arrangement of one teacher and 25 to 30 students is changing. More flexible arrangements and greater teacher responsibilities now exist. There is also an uneasiness among educators related to an increasing awareness of student subcultures which exist within the school. The informal, but powerful, subcultures serve to express emerging student needs, to mediate the impact of official school policies, rules, and regulations on individual students, and hence to reduce the power and control of school personnel over individual students. The need for such control, from the school's perspective, remains, however. The school's response, therefore, is often a tightening of rules and regulations, a resistance to innovation and needed reform, a search for scapegoats, and considerable self-doubt and internal conflict. School needs being served by these responses relate to power, control, maintenance of authority systems, and evaluation processes over individual students.

Schools which respond with these needs uppermost in mind tend to create a climate making for adversary relations with students. Conflict between school personnel and students is a natural consequence. The extent to which this conflict becomes undesirable is a function of student and school goals, the perceptivity of leaders, the ability of students and school personnel to remain flexible under pressure and to make needed adaptations and adjustments. The point at which conflict becomes undesirable varies from school to school, but is usually experienced as such when loss of control is seen as imminent by either party.

Community Needs. The increased mobility of well-educated families and individual citizens has contributed to changes in school-related needs of communities. This is due in part to the managerial employee transfer policies of major corporations, governmental and private aid programs to economically less fortunate people,[69] a heightened awareness of the right of racial, ethnic, and religious minorities to be heard and respected,[70] Supreme Court decisions[71] affecting educational policy making, and an emerging valuing process[72] which supports a richness of diversity.

Community needs will continue to change. These needs are reflected in different demands on the schools. There is less cohesiveness and greater diversity within a given community as to its expectations for the school's performance. Such expectations are now more idiosyncratic in nature. There is less agreement on broad central themes and social indoctrination programs. Parents have aspirations which vary from child to child, depending upon their assessment of the child's needs and capabilities. They expect and, perhaps rightly so, that schools should be equally sensitive to such differences and respond accordingly. At the same time, communities are demanding more programs for adults and senior citizens. The range of requested services is also increasing to include vocational preparation, special education for the exceptional child, help with avocational interests, mid-life counseling, and programs related to a new awareness of self and others.

---

[69] Numerous programs such as aid for dependent children, unemployment compensation, food stamps, emergency relief funds, medical services for the indigent, and numerous other services by community action committees are funded by federal, state, and local governments and by private agencies such as United Way, The Salvation Army, Goodwill Industries, and religious organizations.

[70] U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, 1 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967).

[71] Ibid.

[72] Rogers, "Toward a Modern Approach to Values," op. cit., pp. 160-67; and Philip H. Phenix, "Values in the Emerging American Civilization," Teachers College Record, 61 (April 1960), pp. 355-66.

Communities have developed a new awareness of their "rights" and are pressing their demands for more information and greater involvement in school decision making.[73] The willingness and ability of schools to respond to such expressed community needs affects the kind, intensity, and duration of ensuing school-community conflict.

School-community conflict becomes undesirable when community support and resources are curtailed and become insufficient to permit the development or continuation of mutually acceptable educational programs for students.

The School as a Setting in Which Conflict Takes Place

The controversy surrounding schools is a visible indication that segments of society still value the school as an institution for educating and inducting youth into the adult world. In the minds of many people, schools are still seen as a place where basic skills should be taught, knowledge of the culture transmitted, self-discipline acquired, a knowledge base developed for future work in higher education, vocational skills imparted, and, most importantly, an identity given. Schools have performed these functions in the past. They have, however, performed them for a more limited clientele, even as their programmatic focus was narrower. The very success of the schools in performing these functions for limited numbers of people has brought about a demand from upward mobile, racial, ethnic, and religious minority groups and individuals for equal treatment in the acquisition of "an education" which will lead to the good life. The failure of schools to perform equally well this function for all students, whether out of obstinancy, inability, lack of resources, or lack of interest, has resulted in much controversy.

---

[73] For detailed accounts of schools and communities in conflict and citizen demands for involvement, the reader is referred to newspaper accounts of the Louisville, Boston, and Charlotte-Mecklinburg school controversies.

It is generally recognized that the acquisition of status, control, power, organizational roles, authority, technical competency, a personal sense of identity, material possessions, economic rewards, and involvement in satisfying relationships are all ways people have of meeting their needs. Students and communities are demanding that schools perform the functions necessary to allow all students equal access to these "success" symbols. These demands are similar to those which take place within industry, within social and economic organizations, and indeed within families among/between siblings and parents. However, there are strong forces at work to prevent "equal access" opportunities from developing.

The school serves as a meeting place, a focal point in community life where the struggle of students and parents for such symbols becomes visible, leads to conflict, and is associated with schools and the role they play. Schools which systematically refuse to accept the role of an impartial facilitator for acquiring "success symbols" or which are unable to do so have been and will continue to be embroiled in educational conflicts of one kind or another.

CHAPTER II

STUDENT-STUDENT CONFLICT

Introduction

This chapter focuses on undesirable student-student conflict in a school setting. Although much student-student conflict has its origin in non-school settings, such conflict is often continued in school settings and, therefore, attracts the attention of school personnel. Not all student-student conflict is undesirable, however. Conflict among students can be and often is a natural and healthy extension of the competitive needs of students to express themselves, to experience new challenges, and to learn new ways of defining self and coping with environmental stresses. The intensity and impact of the conflict upon the participants and the environment itself determine whether the conflict is undesirable.

Assumptions

It is assumed that student conflict grows out of needs shared by all human beings for food, shelter, sex, water, rest, order, security, familiarity, affection, belonging, sharing, receiving, giving, being physically strong, having a sense of achievement, self-respect, a sense of adequacy, being needed, a positive evaluation by others, independence, self-sufficiency, self-control, and fulfillment of their potential.

Maslow and others[74] support this view by suggesting that all human beings have physiological, safety, love, esteem, autonomy, and self-actualization needs. Much student conflict is related to students' efforts to meet their needs.

It is further assumed that when student needs are adequately met, students will engage in less conflict-producing behavior. A corollary assumption is that the greater the need deficiency experienced by a student, the greater the potential for conflict. Many, but not all, student needs can be met by other students. Student-student conflict, therefore, is more related to deficiencies in some need areas than in others.

Students' physiological need deficiencies (e.g., food, shelter, clothing) cannot, by and large, be adequately provided by other students. However, their safety, love, and esteem needs (security, affection, a sense of belongingness, sharing with others, accepting self, accepting others, the development of one's physical strength, having a sense of achievement, self-respect, a sense of being needed, and receiving positive evaluation by others) can be provided by other students and, hence, are potential sources of student-student conflict. The fulfillment of autonomy and self-actualization needs (a sense of independence, self-sufficiency, self-control, and the acquisition of skills and competencies leading to development of one's full potential) are more apt to be controlled by adults, at least in the earlier years, and thus are less apt to be sources of potential student-student conflict.

---

[74] Maslow, op. cit., pp. 370-96; and Glasser, Reality Therapy, op. cit., pp. 5-41.

The mechanisms which affect the fulfillment of student needs (time, human responsiveness, availability of resources, and involvement in decision making) are assumed to be major factors in creating need deficiencies which lead to conflict or in fulfillment which leads to the avoidance of conflict.

It is further assumed that student-student conflict, as in conflict between adults, is often the result of inadequate interpersonal relations or a genuine scarcity of the means necessary to fulfill one's needs. The absence of adequate food, shelter, rest, and clothing and the inability to fulfill these needs within acceptable patterns of behavior will lead to undesirable student behavior. Similarly, the absence of student skills, competencies, and resources necessary to acquire those goods or services essential to need fulfillment is also a major factor leading to unacceptable or undesirable student behaviors. For many students, control of acceptable means for achieving their goals is not possible. It is at this point that unacceptable behaviors, which often lead to undesirable conflict, come into play.

Finally, it is assumed that student-student conflict becomes undesirable conflict when the interacting behavior among and between students does not adequately provide for the needs of the students involved within acceptable peer group or adult frames of reference.

Forms of Undesirable Student-Student Conflict

Undesirable student-student conflict takes many forms. Such forms include manipulating, stereotyping, humiliating, competing, fighting, segregating, coercing, and nonconforming. Manipulating involves a "setting up" process, whereby students are made to look foolish, stupid, and/or ignorant or are duped into behaving in non-self-serving ways by other students through efforts supposedly aimed at helping the student for his own good. Manipulating involves giving misleading or partially correct information, the effect of which is detrimental to the person receiving help. Stereotyping involves behavior which perpetuates attitudinal biases against individual students or student groups. It is intended to keep these individual students or student groups in an unfavorable position relative to the student or student group doing the stereotyping. Humiliating involves a process of talking down to a student, belittling a student's accomplishments, acting superior to selected students, ridiculing a student in the presence of others, "bad mouthing" student groups, and criticizing the clothes, speech, and mannerisms of "different" students. Undesirable competition involves an excessive striving for grades, peer group recognition, membership in student clubs, or control of student leadership positions. It reflects an obsessiveness with symbols of status and mechanisms of power and control to the end of depriving others of symbols needed for growth and preventing them from participating in decision making processes. Fighting involves physical abuse of one student or student group by another student or student group. Undesirable fighting takes advantage of or renders ineffective the other person. It involves the destruction of human dignity and self-respect and has the impact of extending one student's control over another student by force. Segregating involves actively ignoring another's presence, isolating others on the basis of characteristics such as sex, race, class, and ability, and refusing or failing to include others in activities, with the aim of unduly setting apart and holding up for ridicule individuals or groups based on perceived differences. Coercion involves the use of threats, violence, "browbeating," and "shaking down." Through the use of other forms of intimidation, coercion extends the control of one student over another for purposes not consistent with mutually acceptable goals. Nonconformity involves a conscious rejection and violation of student norms, standards, practices, and procedures by an individual in such a way as to threaten the group's existence or the student's own identity or membership in the group.

Manipulating. Student-student conflict involving undesirable manipulation has as its primary focus THE INTENTION OF REDUCING THE OTHER STUDENT'S SENSE OF SELF WITHOUT THAT STUDENT REALIZING IT AND, BY IMPLICATION, INDIRECTLY INCREASING THE MANIPULATOR'S OWN SENSE OF SELF. Specific forms of manipulation between students include using flattery, exhibiting false sincerity, loaning clothes, cars, jewelry, and other personal possessions -- activities that induce guilt on the part of the other student, and/or sympathy for the manipulator, promise possible future rewards for current conforming behaviors, and exchange valued items such as friendship for security, sex for visibility, and privileges for loyalty.

Stereotyping. Stereotyping which leads to student-student conflict is the result of A STUDENT OR STUDENT GROUP REFUSING TO RECOGNIZE AND ACCEPT ANOTHER STUDENT AS AN INDIVIDUAL WITH UNIQUE CHARACTERISTICS AND ATTRIBUTES but, rather, insisting on treating the other student as a member of an inferior and different group. Specific behaviors involve telling stories which "put down" a group or groups of people, using phrases such as "they are all alike," and making assumptions about individuals on the basis of their race or other visible characteristics. Stereotyping is perpetuated by the use of cliches in discussions about individual students or student groups. Students perpetuate stereotypes when they refuse to accept the ideas and feelings of other students contrary to their own accepted images of those individuals and groups. Failure to differentiate between facts and opinions as they relate to human characteristics and behaviors fosters stereotyping. An important characteristic of the process of developing a stereotype is using well-known situational information about an individual or group and generalizing to other situations, individuals, and/or groups. It often involves the use of obvious physical characteristics (such as color of skin, shape of eyes, texture of hair, shape of lips, width of nose, speech patterns, height, or clothing styles) to generalize about nonphysical attributes (such as intelligence, sexual prowess, feelings, and interests). Another technique used in the development of stereotypes is the use of an observable talent to suggest the absence of a contrasting talent; for example, feeling individuals are non-thinking persons, athletes cannot be brains, feminine students are by definition not strong, and masculine students are less feeling. Other stereotyping processes involve the use of negative associations as a basis of generalization (e.g., his older brother was a troublemaker, and he will be one also). Stereotyping is used to maintain distance in a relationship by structuring the perceptions one student has of another, and it functions most frequently where information is partial and inconclusive. To change a stereotype would require a reexamination of one's behaviors and values.

Individual students who attempt to reject the stereotype assigned to them face an uphill battle which often leads to conflict. Rejecting a stereotype is not simply a matter of rejecting the characteristics assigned to oneself; it involves modifying a whole system of thought.

Humiliation. Conflict evolving out of humiliation is an acknowledgment that humiliating behaviors INVOLVE IDENTIFYING DIFFERENCES AND PUTTING MORE POSITIVE VALUES ON ONE'S OWN CHARACTERISTICS, POSSESSIONS, OR ATTRIBUTES. Students who humiliate other students do so through telling stories about the other person which may or may not be true. They may use a "catty" tone of voice in conversation with the other student or examine in great detail another student's dress, hair, or makeup, usually to that student's disadvantage. These students also tend to make a "big thing" of clothing labels or types of shoes and often discuss in negative terms the kind of food another student prefers and eats. Students humiliate other students by showing off their own expensive tastes in clothing, hair styles, and recreational plans. The use of comparison is a common vehicle for humiliating another person. A significant way to humiliate another person is to discuss differences in colleges to be attended, careers which have been planned, and the difficulty involved in being successful in one's chosen field. Asking another person in an apparently sincere way to perform in a setting under difficult situations or at inappropriate places and times is a favored means of humiliating a student.

Undesirable Competition. ENHANCING ONESELF THROUGH WINNING AND DEMONSTRATING THAT ONE IS BETTER THAN OTHERS OR THE BEST IN A GROUP is at the heart of conflict resulting from undesirable competition. Undesirable behaviors which often lead to conflict include arguing a point with another student beyond its functional importance, assigning a high value on over-learning material and ideas, boasting about one's efficiency and effectiveness or about how hard one works, and striving to win more recognition than other students and in more fields of endeavor. Internal conflict is often the result of students' failure to accept any limitation as realistic for themselves. In many types of competition, an insistence on adherence to procedures, policies, and guidelines governing a selected area of competition leads to dysfunctional conflict. Mastering of details becomes an end in itself. Discussions which involve an evaluation, judgment, or the relative merit of an idea, service, product, or people are forms of competition which lead to undesirable conflict. Students who accept and perpetuate criteria in which goodness is related to efficiency, quantity, size, or speed, or who reject humanistic conceptions of people and strive for machine-like or computer-like perfectability foster undesirable conflict. Finally, when students reject the importance of "essence" in favor of "becoming," they have adopted a competing modality which in all probability will lead to continued conflict, some of which will be undesirable.

Fighting. Fighting, one of the more commonly perceived forms of undesirable conflict, is in reality AN ATTEMPT ON THE PART OF STUDENTS TO ESTABLISH FAVORABLE POWER RELATIONSHIPS AS A MEANS OF DEMONSTRATING THEIR STRENGTH AND ACHIEVING A DESIRABLE IDENTITY. It involves efforts to destroy an opposing student's will or ability to compete and to personally confront those students who serve to restrict one's sense of autonomy or who function as symbols of authority. Fighting takes many forms, including the physical abuse of another student unable or unwilling to become involved. It involves the use of weapons to hurt, maim, or inflict pain or do violence to another student. Inflicting psychological or emotional stress on another student is a devastating form of conflict. Restricting another student's freedom of movement by physical restraints or diminishing, destroying, or incapacitating the student's will or ability to direct his or her own affairs are also forms of conflict that can be classified as fighting. Perhaps the most degrading forms of fighting are those behaviors which physically force another student to do something against his or her will, including actions involving rape, sodomy, beating, torturing, performing sex acts with a third party, or unwilling consumption of drugs, alcohol, or other stimulants and depressants.

Segregation. One of the more complicated forms of conflict between students has to do with segregation. Students tend TO SEGREGATE THOSE INDIVIDUALS WHO SERVE AS A SOURCE OF EMBARRASSMENT, GUILT, OR COMPETITION. Those segregated may serve as a mirror of the student's own lack of integrity, weaknesses, and faults, and remind the student of his or her imperfectability. The act of segregating involves ignoring the presence, characteristics, behaviors, and verbal contributions of another student. It can further involve the designating of areas whose use is restricted to identified student groups, the assigning of a status and/or specific task to groups based on unstated but known criteria such as race, sex, and appearance. Segregation also tends to maintain invisible boundaries between groups based on place of residence, occupation of parents, clothing, or patterns of speaking. It separates students on the basis of differences where values are assigned and agreed to which have the impact of fixing identities, often adversely. Such segregation is often intended to reduce the potential competitiveness involved between groups.

Coercion. Coercion-type student-student conflicts are ESSENTIALLY DEFENSIVE TACTICS TO AVOID LOSING. Coercion usually involves stress, intimidation, domination, and a visible effort to secure conforming behavior through pressure tactics as opposed to appeals for cooperation. Behaviors include threatening students with physical harm if they don't "share" or "stop doing" something, and involve a specific situation such as one male student paying undue attention to the girlfriend of another male student. Coercion conflict is the result of one student intimidating another about classroom "achievement-oriented" behavior. Groups of students often put pressure on individual students to conform to norms of rejecting teacher overtures, to use drugs, to smoke, to drink, to "make out." Expressing possessiveness or jealousy toward a friend to limit the friend's contact with others is a specific form of coercion-type conflict.

Nonconformity. EFFORTS TO MAINTAIN AND ENHANCE ONE'S OWN SELF-CONCEPT often lead to nonconformity-type conflict between students. Specific nonconforming behaviors often include withdrawing from active verbal participation in a group, behaving consistent with rejected criteria rather than with group-approved norms (i.e., unilateral vs. group-approved statements), and suggesting ideas inappropriate to a group's activity which hinder the group's effectiveness. Nonconformity conflict also involves constantly identifying minor inadequacies of group plans and behaviors, suggesting goals and procedures inconsistent with group-approved goals and procedures, rejecting the group's right to evaluate or judge one's contribution or competency, and obstructing group progress by disagreeing with group values and criteria for making decisions. It should be noted again that all conflict is not perceived as equally undesirable or, indeed, as undesirable. Rather, at some point conflict is judged as being undesirable. What is viewed as undesirable student-student conflict in one setting would not be so judged in another. The potential contribution of conflict for healthy growth and change in individuals and the environment are critical elements in deciding the undesirability of student-student conflict.

Hypotheses About Sources of Student-Student Conflict

The following hypotheses relate to sources of student-student conflict. They evolved from: (1) an analysis of selected interviews with clinical psychologists, psychiatrists, family therapists, school counselors, social workers, policemen and other persons in allied fields; (2) a review of materials related to growth and development patterns, human needs, and youthful delinquency; and (3) the investigator's own knowledge and experience as a teacher, administrator, researcher, and consultant in the areas of human potential, social-psychology, educational administration, communication, and conflict management. The hypotheses represent a synthesis of individual, but often similar, examples of conflict drawn from these sources. They suggest a basis for broadly looking at these conflicts as they relate to basic causes.

HYPOTHESIS #1: STUDENT-STUDENT CONFLICT IS AN OUTGROWTH OF STUDENT EFFORTS TO ACQUIRE AN IDENTITY CONSISTENT WITH THE STUDENT'S SELF-CONCEPT AND ASPIRATIONS.

Achieving an identity is the single most important task for any individual. Failure to achieve a recognized and accepted identity leads to continued conflict, often irreconcilable, throughout an individual's lifetime. To this end, individuals create peer groups, define territories from which to function, delineate boundaries which separate and distinguish one group from another, create numerous activities in which their abilities can be tested against one another, and simultaneously participate in those undertakings which set them apart from their fellowmen.

Students acquire an identity based on behavioral efforts to satisfy their basic needs. Undesirable behaviors and negative identity need to be examined in the context of a basic need system capable of explaining such behaviors. Students who have adequate skills, resources, and competency to fulfill basic needs tend to behave in acceptable ways most of the time. Students who do not have or cannot acquire such skills, resources, and competencies are forced into acquiring substitute skills, often including behaving in undesirable ways to meet basic needs.

The data cited earlier in this study suggest that basic needs related to physiological considerations, safety, esteem, love, autonomy, and self-actualization provide a conceptualization for looking at human behaviors. Student behavior such as stealing can be better understood if seen in the context of fulfilling a student's need for love or survival. Stealing, then, is more capable of being dealt with constructively than if seen in the isolated context of just "bad behavior." Students fighting on the playground may be an example of undesirable behavior. It certainly affects the identity the student is acquiring. If, however, the fight is perceived in the context of achieving and/or maintaining peer group status as opposed to a random brutalizing activity, it can be better understood and dealt with. The manner in which such incidents are dealt with profoundly affects the identity the student is acquiring.

A student who continually withdraws from interacting with other students can be dealt with more effectively if that behavior can be seen in the context of feelings of inadequacy, rejection, or lack of social skills as opposed to being viewed from an attitude of "he doesn't care." Such initial undesirable student behavior is often a student's "risk capital." It involves a desperate or extreme effort on the part of the student to get basic needs fulfilled and to acquire an identity.

HYPOTHESIS #2: STUDENT-STUDENT CONFLICT IS AN OUTGROWTH OF STUDENTS EXPRESSING THEIR VALUES, BELIEFS, FEARS, AND ASPIRATIONS IN THE PRESENCE OF OTHER STUDENTS.

Individuals are created and have a being prior to becoming and achieving a role in a given society. The process of fully developing that being takes place within a group or social context. The natural expression of one's self in the presence of others based on the individual's uniqueness leads to conflict. The environment itself has an impact upon the student's definition of self and the fuller development of that self.

Student conflict which is a natural outgrowth of student feelings, values, aspirations, and fears relates to the need for peer group status, a sense of physical coordination, development of overall strength and stamina, and the need to be intellectually competent, i.e., to reason, analyze, and understand abstractions and relationships. It is also important for students to be emotionally capable of relating and being related to by male and female students, to know that they are capable of feeling great emotions, to feel a sense of oneness with their environment and with mankind in general, and to interpret their environment in realistic ways as to its safety, its potential destructiveness, and its potential resourcefulness. Students need to be spontaneous, to be independent, to be perceived as mature, to increasingly gain control over their own destinies, to feel a sense of responsibility for their own behavior, and to establish their independence. Students also need to develop leadership, fulfill group expectations, minimize risk, maximize opportunities, and gain acceptance and recognition. Indeed, growing up is a conflictual experience.

HYPOTHESIS #3: STUDENT-STUDENT CONFLICT IS AN OUTGROWTH OF COMPETITION FOR SCARCE BUT DESIRABLE ROLES, RELATIONSHIPS, SERVICES, PRODUCTS, AND REWARDS.

One focus of an industrial society has to do with producing material goods and providing services for its citizens. Economic concepts based on the scarcity of materials have permeated much of the social, educational, and political thinking in our culture as well as affecting the personal relationships of people. Much student-student conflict is directly related to actual scarcities, and this pattern of behavior carries over into activities where such scarcities by definition need not exist.

The absence or unavailability of resources, goods, and services essential to fulfilling one's goals and aspirations inevitably places a premium upon such factors as control, autonomy, power, influence, and status. Conflict is a natural consequence of excessive competition among students for scarce rewards and the limited symbols of recognition perceived as critical for achieving their goals and aspirations. In an environment in which scarcity is a norm and substitute symbols are unacceptable, in which competitive student behaviors, characteristics, and performances are valued highly, conflict is inevitable.

The norms which have been identified and deemed acceptable by the broader society tend to govern the means by which students fulfill their needs. Although norms change gradually over time, the slow acceptance of means developed by students increases the potential for conflict among students.

HYPOTHESIS #4: STUDENT-STUDENT CONFLICT IS AN OUTGROWTH OF ADULT SUPPORT FOR COMPETITION AS A MEANS OF INSURING INDIVIDUAL SUCCESS AND SOCIAL SURVIVAL.

Every society has developed a structure involving roles, relationships, and processes which provides for the necessary needs of people and maintenance of the social order. The marshalling of human resources to that end has universally been a collective responsibility. American society, based upon a competitive philosophy and system of thought, requires a constant infusion of individuals who have been trained to compete and to survive. Student-student competition which often leads to conflict is a major component of that training program. The abundance of formal and informal regulations which govern the lives of students is matched by a system of public and private agencies created to help manage the behavior of students who are unable to successfully negotiate their way through the built-in situational conflicts.[75]

Although student-student conflict is troublesome, often vexing, and at times seriously destructive, it does serve as a barometer for

---

[75] A sampling of public and private agencies serving the needs of youth in one school attendance area of a medium-sized school district in the southeastern part of the United States produced a list of over 75 agencies, not including the school, the family, or churches.

monitoring the commitment of youth to values established by adults within the social order. It further confirms the necessity of many adult roles. The Utopian absence of conflict would eliminate the need for many policemen, vice-principals in charge of student discipline, juvenile court officers, correctional workers at juvenile penal institutions, numerous social welfare and case workers, personnel at halfway houses, psychiatrists, clinical psychologists, and school counselors, to name a few. These and other adult roles are vitally dependent upon the continued existence of intra- and interpersonal student conflict. Efforts to seriously reduce the incidence of student conflict is threatening to a segment of the adult population and is also seriously resisted.

Strategies for Managing Student-Student Conflicts

Strategies available for managing student conflicts include both avoidance and approach type strategies. Avoidance strategies recognize the importance of goals related to survival and conservation of resources. Approach strategies recognize the importance of goals related to control and problem solving. Students' awareness of conflict, their acknowledgment of its existence, and their willingness to become involved in it are also critical to the management of conflict.

The conflict management model in Figure 1 illustrates the potential relationship between selected strategies and student awareness of conflict and goals.

CONFLICT MANAGEMENT STRATEGY MODEL

Denial Acknowledgment Involvement

Existence of Conflict

	Avoidance Strategies		Approach Strategies	
Passive	Self-Survival	Conservation/Maintenance of Resources and Options	Control of People	Problem Solving
	1. Withdrawal	1. Repression	1. Threats	1. Isolation of Issues
	2. Displacement	2. Conciliation	2. Manipulation	2. Fact Finding
Behaviors		3. Resistance	3. Coercion (Authority)	3. Smoothing
			4. Deterrence	4. Confrontation
			5. Physical Aggression	5. Mediation
Active				6. Compromise

Figure 1. An analysis of conflict management strategies along an Existence-of-Conflict scale, categorized by type of strategy.

Avoidance Strategies. Avoidance strategies are used to avoid, minimize, or restrict student involvement in conflict. Two avoidance strategies that are concerned primarily with self-survival include withdrawal and displacement. These strategies are aimed at minimizing the intensity and changing the focus of conflicts. Withdrawal emphasizes the creation of a low profile and minimizing personal risks. Passive and inactive students are frequently using withdrawal strategies. Displacement strategies place emphasis on substituting less conflicting or more manageable issues for those under consideration. Students who blame or criticize other students for their own misfortunes or lack of success are often using a displacement strategy. In most instances, avoidance strategies are ways of coping with uncontrollable events and people as well as rejecting personal responsibility to and accountability for those people and events.

Other avoidance strategies have to do with the conservation or maintenance of resources and options and include repression, conciliation, and resistance. The primary focus of these strategies is to protect what one has. Repression creates internal conflict but serves to minimize the verbalization of feelings and attitudes that create conflict with other students. Conciliation is an attempt to appease or deflect unwanted attention from students and other persons. Resistance is used when necessary to defend basic concerns and interests. As an avoidance strategy, it is usually used in reaction to an act of aggression or threat. Avoidance strategies involving aggressive behavior is essentially oriented towards minimizing losses, as opposed to maximizing gains.

These strategies are security-oriented, defensive in nature, and often focus on neutralizing the demands of an opponent.

Approach Strategies. Approach strategies involve more active confrontations of people and/or situations. One approach strategy involves efforts to control people. This is essentially a win-lose strategy involving threats, manipulation, coercion (use of authority), exercise of deterrents, and physical aggression. In this strategy, other students are perceived as a threat, a source of need deprivation, or a cause of conflict. The assumption is made that a proactive stance is better for the purpose of controlling or gaining from conflict with a student opponent. Threats are frequently spontaneous, give the illusion of power, invoke the unknown, create tension, define relationships, and involve a minimum expenditure of energy and resources. Manipulation involving deception is a more subtle approach in which the goals sought and methods used are often kept hidden from the students being manipulated. Coercion often involves the use of personal or positional authority to get other students to accept goals or procedures with which they do not agree. This may involve either rewards or punishments. Deterrence is a form of communicating that undesirable behaviors will be forcefully dealt with. The implication is that such an encounter would go badly for the other student and therefore, hopefully, he or she would respond in acceptable ways. Physical aggression can be an undesirable encounter between students or student groups. It is a simplistic approach to the management of very complex student problems and concerns. Physical conflict is a way for students to directly express their disagreements and does not require as much planning or detailed analysis of motives or goals. Such a strategy tends to reduce complex problems to simple issues in the minds of the participants. It offers immediate gratification (pain or satisfaction) and it assumes that conflicts can be settled instantaneously through the concept of might makes right.

Perhaps the most sophisticated approach strategy in the management of conflict is problem solving, which more frequently tends to produce win-win solutions. It essentially involves the isolation of issues, fact-finding, smoothing, confrontation, mediation, and compromise. Problem solving rests upon the assumption that involved students wish to manage the conflict effectively, that there is a possible solution to the conflict that can result in both students gaining something of value, and it relies upon methods which involve a sophisticated conceptualization of human needs and how those needs are satisfied through symbols and delayed gratification systems. Problem solving also focuses on the need to maintain a sense of structure and order within a social setting. It recognizes that students and student groups are interconnected and that student conflicts do affect the prevailing educational setting.

Isolating the issues is an attempt by students to confine the conflict to manageable proportions. It reduces the level of involvement, time, and resources needed to reach an acceptable agreement among and between students. Fact-finding is involved when it appears that the data available for consideration do not adequately define the problem which has led to the conflict.

Smoothing is a strategy recognizing the psychological and emotional aspects of student conflict. It also recognizes the need to focus primarily on the issues involved rather than on the behaviors exhibited. Confrontation is a means of testing for reality. It provides a vehicle for giving both negative and positive feedback, for testing one's strength against the other student's strength, and it tends to clarify the issues involved in the conflict. Mediation involves a recognition that the students in conflict need the assistance of a third party to reach a satisfactory agreement. Mediation is most successful when the third party behaves in a carefully prescribed manner with limited authority. Compromise represents an acknowledgment that choices involve costs, that rewards and resources are often scarce and frequently unavailable. Compromise also recognizes the interdependence of a relationship as a means of achieving mutual need satisfaction.

Strategies for managing student-student conflicts can also be classified according to the focus of the strategy. In each instance, effective strategy involves changing "something" to effect a more acceptable condition, relationship, or state of being. Strategies may be classified as focusing on changing the needs or goals of students, the means by which students participate in a conflict, the conditions affecting the conduct of student conflict and the premises upon which such conflict rests, matters of timing, the patterns of communication utilized in the conflict, the use of external control mechanisms, and the values which affect student involvement in conflict.

The goals for which students engage in conflict or the needs which focus their involvement may be changed. Current goals which increase the potential for conflict among students can be de-emphasized. Alternative goals acceptable to students can be identified and made more visible. Some alternative goals could provide for greater physical activity to develop self-confidence, coordination, and less harmful competition. Peer groups could be helped to develop objectives emphasizing socially acceptable behaviors and meaningful roles for student members. More cooperative endeavors could be developed through de-emphasizing goals and procedures which place a high priority on win-lose relationships and excessive competition.

Improving decision making processes, structures, and other means is critical to future management of conflict between students. This involves substituting more acceptable forms of conflict for those currently in existence. It also suggests that the processes for developing new strategies for managing student conflict take into consideration the wishes of students. Involving students is the first step in getting their cooperation and approval. Without such approval, implementation is seriously jeopardized. The following strategies are suggested as representative of such involvement approaches: (1) the creation of crisis centers for use by students in conflict, (2) the substitution of discussion sessions for physical encounters, (3) training sessions to help students acquire needed skills and competencies in managing their own conflicts, (4) training sessions to help students develop their leadership ability, (5) discussion sessions focusing on causes of student tensions and frustrations which lead to conflicts, (6) involvement of mutually accepted students in mediating student-student conflict, (7) routine and ongoing discussions of racial, sexual, and ethnic differences among students, (8) mixed peer group discussions of community, school, and peer group attitudes, norms, needs, and fears, (9) unstructured open communication sessions for students, parents, and school personnel, (10) establishment of student-controlled coordinating agencies to facilitate communication among and between student groups and individual students, (11) individual counseling for students, (12) an increase in the means by which student goals can be achieved, (13) the development of a student monitoring system to identify basic student need deficiencies before conflict emerges, (14) a program for helping students to develop an awareness of themselves and the impact of their behaviors upon others, (15) the development of student guidelines which recognize the need of all students for security, acceptance, respect, autonomy, and fulfillment, and (16) an increase in the visibility of structures and procedures available to students for dealing with student-student conflict. Such structures could include a judicial system composed of student peer representatives which would function to (1) manage conflict between students, (2) facilitate student-student discussion of critical areas in which conflict is prevalent, (3) require conflicting students to develop cooperative projects as a means of getting to know and work effectively with each other on a voluntary basis, (4) increase the number of projects available for students with unique and individual needs, and (5) develop activity calendars for involving students in their own growth and development.

Existing educational, social, psychological, and economic constraints affect the nature of student-student conflict. The unequal availability of scarce symbols such as leadership roles, grades, praise, acceptance, trust, and freedom, to mention a few, also leads to student-student conflict. The lack of basic necessities also often leads to undesirable behaviors such as stealing, "shaking down," vandalism, fighting, and threats.

The development of peer group reward systems is one strategy students have evolved for coping with unacceptable adult expectations and rewards. Other strategies include developing student awareness of their social, economic, and political power as a means of confronting the adult-imposed constraints. Strategies based on the development of student subcultures where different constraints govern behavior is another strategy, but usually practical only for teenagers and older youth. Strategies which accept the social and economic constraints of a conflict situation rely on student ability to adjust. Emphasis is placed upon students acquiring skills of obedience, deference, conciliation, and acceptance. Such skills, however, are related less to effectively managing student-student conflict than to coping with adult-imposed constraints.

Strategies for improving the conditions and reducing the constraints within which student conflict takes place are primarily a function of adults, organizations, and representatives of the broader society. However, it is possible for students to be involved in (1) identifying conditions which foster student conflict, (2) expressing the frustrations and hurt involved in attempting to comply with adult-imposed conditions, (3) developing guidelines to eliminate the double-bind students experience in trying to meet conflicting social expectations and individual needs, and (4) developing programs for confronting and modifying the conditions which lead to undesirable student conflict.

An important aspect of managing student-student conflict has to do with questions of timing. The development of a keen sense of timing can eliminate many student-student conflicts. Helping students pace their needs consistent with available resources can go a long way toward eliminating unnecessary and undesirable student conflict. Delaying discussions about a conflict until students have had sufficient time to "cool down" makes rational discussion of problems more effective. Appropriate use of time precludes inadequate decision making, increases the knowledge base upon which decisions can be based, and increases students' awareness of others' needs. Time is also a critical factor to students in adjusting their own behavior to changing situations and in maintaining individual integrity, autonomy, and willingness to cooperate.

The availability and use of time is a function of values related to efficiency and effectiveness. Setting deadlines, use of time for preplanning, providing time for meetings, structuring the use of meeting time, committing time needed to complete a task, accepting the need for "down" time, all relate to strategies for effective use of time and issues of timing in managing various student-student conflicts.

Student-student conflict generated by honest differences of opinion and needs will not always disappear with more adequate communication.

However, strategies which increase students' awareness of their own needs and help them develop an ability to honestly communicate that need to others increase the potential for self-understanding and self-control. Adequate attention to the other student's needs and the use of words which suggest a willingness to work together can reduce student-student conflict. Effective communication is an essential tool for identifying commonalities which frequently form the basis for cooperative behaviors. Positive and negative feedback sessions are also important strategies for managing student-student conflicts. It is important to help students develop realistic insights to the cause of conflict. Effective communication as a strategy involves listening, sharing, paraphrasing, giving and receiving feedback, accepting, confronting, and supporting. It also involves the ability to relate events to needs and to facilitate self-direction in others.

Some student-student conflict, because of historical relationships and personalities involved, can be managed only through the use of external agents. Such situations require the presence of persons authorized to make appropriate interventions when necessary. Constant adult supervision is one strategy which is widely used to control student conflict. School personnel and other adults responsible for managing student-student conflict need to be trained as mediators. They should be capable of helping parents become more aware of student needs and existing patterns of student behavior for fulfilling those needs. They must be willing to have numerous informal contacts with students who have need for effective adult models. Parents should be involved with educators and students in discussing student-student conflict. School personnel should be trained to accept the existence of student peer group subcultures and to differentiate between healthy groups which assist student growth and development and unhealthy groups which detract from student growth and development. The use of police or other restraint-oriented authorities constitutes a last resort in the management of student-student conflict. The use of external controls, while at times necessary, is an inadequate substitute for the development of internalized controls for the same purpose.

Another strategy for managing student-student conflict is the joint development of new structures in which adults and students share equally in controlling the conditions, constraints, and rewards which affect the behaviors of students. This strategy involves an emphasis upon acceptance, resourcefulness, openness, trust, and numerous other positive relationships. An analysis of healthy and open families provides some encouragement for this line of thinking.

Potential Effectiveness of Suggested Strategies for Managing Student-Student Conflict

It is difficult to predict whether a proposed strategy will be effective in managing a student conflict. Effectiveness is a multivariate function involving factors related to (1) each student's needs, goals, resources, and competencies, (2) the nature of the issue at conflict, and (3) the conditions surrounding the conflict, such as availability of time, cultural norms, outside vested interests, and information available to conflicting students, to mention a few. Conflict management strategies can be effective or not, depending on whether students in conflict have mutual interests and similar goals and agree on the desired outcome of the conflict. Conflict which will change existing relationships between students is valued differently by each student, depending on the current level of satisfaction with the relationship. It is possible, therefore, that conflict management strategies perceived as effective by one student will be perceived as ineffective by another. Conflict management strategies, therefore, should be evaluated in terms of their ability to control conflict perceived as undesirable by the students affected by the conflict. Such management may involve the acceleration of conflict activity if the intensity of interaction is insufficient to generate behavior aimed at a reduction of conflict. Conflict is a tool which can be used by participants to achieve unique ends. Conflict management, therefore, should function to bring about changes in understanding, acceptance of others, skills and competencies, attitudes, behaviors, and the allocation of resources which maximize mutually satisfying student relationships.

Within this frame of reference, the following criteria for evaluating the success of proposed conflict management strategies is suggested. Effective conflict management strategies are ones that (1) can be easily learned by the students, (2) can be readily available for use when needed, (3) would leave control of the conflict in the hands of students, (4) would be relatively inexpensive in terms of time, dollars, and expenditure of energy, (5) would be acceptable to students in conflict, (6) will manage the current conflict efficiently and effectively through producing a win-win solution for students, parents, and society, (7) would improve students' ability to manage similar conflicts in the future, (8) would focus on solving problems, not on maintaining existing student relationships, (9) has potential for reducing the frequency of future destructuve conflicts, and (10) has potential applicability for managing a broader range of conflicts.

An additional restriction must be considered. A given strategy may be used in a variety of situations with varying success. In general, avoidance strategies are seen as less effective than approach strategies. However, under some conditions, the needs of individual students might best be served by using an avoidance strategy. Conditions of gross inequities in power and a high order of needs related to safety and security might suggest the use of avoidance strategies. Such strategies as displacement, withdrawal, resistance, and conciliation tend to minimize loss as opposed to maximizing opportunity. Situational factors over which the student has little or no control often determine the strategies which will be most effective for the student. Selection of an avoidance strategy generally does not meet the criteria for producing win-win outcomes and improvement of conflict management competencies.

Approach-oriented conflict management strategies more frequently meet the criteria for effective management strategies identified earlier. However, those approach strategies primarily oriented towards assuring control as opposed to solving problems are viewed as meeting only part of the criteria. Strategies such as the use of threats, manipulation, coercion, the use of deterrents, and physical aggression are seen as more short-range and limited in their potential usefulness than other approach strategies. They tend to create a climate which generates further conflict. Strategies which have as their primary focus the solving of problems and producing win-win solutions are seen as more effective. These include strategies of isolating issues, fact finding, smoothing, mediation, and compromise. These strategies are particularly suited to dealing with the psychological and emotional overtones of many forms of conflict. A limiting factor in their effectiveness, however, is the degree of competency required of the user. Many student-student conflicts are the result of a lack of student competence in dealing with specific issues. The absence of the competencies reflected in these strategies has, in many instances, contributed to the student's inability to manage conflict. Thus, strategies related to controlling people are more frequently used, although perceived as less effective in the long run.

It should be noted that the strategies identified as most effective reflect a functional approach to managing conflict. This approach features a focus on issues rather than symptoms and the use of rationality as major tools for managing conflict. Strategies such as emotion, force, the use of authority, and giving the responsibility for managing conflict to external agents and agencies produce different outcomes and are not viewed as helpful to the development of effective student-student conflict management strategies. The criteria utilized place a high premium upon involving conflicting students in managing their own conflict, efficiently solving present problems with a view toward curtailing future undesirable conflict of the same order, and fostering win-win solutions.

CHAPTER III

STUDENT-SCHOOL CONFLICT

Introduction

The focus of this chapter is on undesirable student-school conflict. Such conflict is a daily overwhelming fact of life in the public schools. It represents a loss in educational opportunity for students and wasted public and professional resources. It further reflects a continuing source of frustration for individual students and their families and highlights the failure of the public schools to perform a designated educational function. Finding ways of reducing the incidence of undesirable student-school conflict and using student-school conflict as a source for improving educational programs are important goals.

Student-school conflicts tend to revolve around and focus on interface activities which take place between students and school personnel related to (1) student abilities and behavior, (2) instructional activities including teacher expectations, competencies, and behaviors, (3) school policies, procedures and enforcement practices, (4) school social-cultural values and norms, (5) student peer group values and behaviors, (6) curriculum offerings, their relevancy and availability to students, and (7) the care and treatment of school facilities and equipment.

Assumptions

Assumptions about student-initiated conflict include the following: (1) Students have a set of expectations about the purpose of school.

74

(2) Those expectations relate to the fulfillment of their own aspirations and goals; and (3) Student-initiated conflict is directly related to students' perceptions of the school's willingness or ability to help them fulfill their aspirations and goals.

Assumptions about school-initiated conflict include: (1) School personnel have a set of expectations about the purpose of the school; (2) Those expectations relate to the role of the school in preparing students to fulfill acceptable social-economic-political roles in the dominant social order; and (3) School-initiated conflict is directly related to the school's perception of student willingness or ability to accept school policies, procedures, and practices.

Forms of Undesirable Student-School Conflict

Undesirable student-school conflict assumes many forms, including passive involvement, withdrawal, active resistance, rejection, organized opposition, and destructive confrontation. These conflicts can be either student-or school-initiated. Figure 1 provides examples of both student- and school-initiated conflict. Student-initiated conflict represents visible symptoms of basic need deficiencies. The inability or unwillingness of school personnel to adequately interpret the meaning of student-initiated conflict tends to increase the intensity of the conflict and produces other forms of conflict beyond that initially observed. Passive involvement is an early symptom indicating conflict between students and school. It suggests the lack of purposes commonly agreed upon between student and school and inadequate communication

FORM OF CONFLICT	STUDENT INITIATED	SCHOOL INITIATED
1. Passive Involvement	poor homework, unprepared for classes, sleeping in class, lying, non-involvement in discussions	don't involve students - failure to cooperate with students on projects, accept student's poor self-concept
2. Withdrawal	absenteeism, cutting class, tardiness, expressions of boredom	no help for students, ignoring lack of student participation
3. Active Resistance	lack of respect, arguing, use of foul language, smoking in prohibited places, insubordination, theft	conscious downplaying of students and student concerns and projects, giving poor grades
4. Rejection	class disruption, fighting, drugs, graffiti, conscious failure to follow rules and regulations, hazardous use of cars	refusing to cooperate, voting against student-oriented projects and programs; detention, removal of students from class, labeling, making poor comparisons
5. Organized Opposition	threats, non-conforming hair and dress styles, gangs, roaming the halls, underground newspapers, flaunting rule violations, anti-school election campaign platforms	development of myths, stereotypes, fears, and antagonisms to students and student-oriented programs; voting against students and student-initiated projects; suspension; selective rule enforcement; development of reward systems which exclude identifiable groups of students and their achievements
6. Destructive Confrontations	vandalism, beatings, arson, use of weapons, assault	imposing sanctions on students, segregating students, exclusions, conspiring to prevent students from achieving and being recognized as leaders

Figure 1. Forms of Undesirable Student-School Conflict

about students' needs and the school's relevance in meeting those needs. If such conflict is not dealt with adequately, the student will subsequently withdraw or actively resist further efforts to influence his learning behavior.

Withdrawal, when associated with poor student achievement, tends to reflect student acceptance of the school's interpretations of the student's ability. Students involved in this form of conflict tend to have less visible support systems available to them. They need considerable help. Students choosing to actively resist the school's interpretation of their ability display their strength by resistance such as arguing, use of foul language, smoking in prohibited places, insubordination, theft, and other similar means. These students exhibit the will and the capacity to define for themselves what they oppose, although not necessarily what they favor.

Rejection behavior, whether on the part of student or school, represents an increased polarization of viewpoints. It suggests an unwillingness to communicate further about the issues in conflict. Unless this is corrected quickly, the students who reject or who are rejected become the alienated members of society. Students cut off from classmates and peer groups find themselves alone and often in opposition to the organized structures created by society. It is a short jump to the formation of loosely organized groups unified by their opposition to schools. This results in some of the more difficult conflicts facing schools. Such opposition is often expressed in the form of hanging around, harassment of teachers, the use of drugs, abuse of younger students, and in other "getting even" activities. Destructive confrontation involves individual students and organized student groups with norms, myths, attitudes, rules, and obligations who are in conflict with the school in a form of win-lose warfare. The inability or unwillingness of such groups or the schools to recognize that major hostility exists, leads to the use of ineffective conflict management strategies.

Passive involvement of students evokes no images of violence and destruction and, hence, is often ignored as a form of undesirable student-school conflict. It is, however, an insidious and undesirable form of conflict. Students not actively engaged in learning, but attending class, are a challenge to teacher integrity and represents a self-destructive act on the part of students. The continuation of such behavior often represents a form of collusion between student and teacher which is full of latent hostility. Student-initiated forms of passive involvement include poorly prepared or uncompleted homework, sleeping in class, failure to participate in group discussions, lack of attention to directions, accepting school-imposed punishments, and similar instances of being present but non-involved. School or teacher-initiated forms of behavior which foster or stimulate passive involvement conflicts include insensitivity to student interests, showing undue interest in a few selected students, failure to involve students in planning, reinforcement of students' negative self-concept, and school approval of a few carefully selected models of student behavior.

Withdrawal forms of conflict initiated by students include cutting class, chronic absenteeism, tardiness, boredom, acceptance of a poor self-concept, failure to initiate communication or to respond to communication efforts, and assigning a low value to school-related activities. Teachers and other school personnel aid and abet student withdrawal by being unavailable to give students help, ignoring students whose learning abilities are marginal, reflecting a lack of interest in student efforts to initiate activities and projects, downplaying student achievement, setting unrealistic goals in relation to student abilities, emphasizing the importance of school procedures, limiting praise to a few selected students, selecting content to be learned unrelated to students' experiences and knowledge base, and developing cultural and ethnic norms and behaviors which are different.

Students unwilling to accept the school's definition of themselves as unacceptable or of less value than other students often actively resist. Such students are, in essence, demanding recognition for themselves as unique individuals deserving of attention and help. Such active resistance often takes the form of a lack of respect for school personnel, arguing with other students and teachers, using foul language in the presence of teachers and students, smoking in washrooms or other prohibited places, being unresponsive to teacher requests, refusing to exhibit subordinate behavior and demeanor, stealing articles from teachers and students, and in general resisting in aggressive ways. Such behavior is frequently oriented towards protecting the student's self-concept, although the behavior may be perceived as inappropriate by others.

Teachers and other school personnel contribute to student resistant behavior by insisting on student conformity to a predetermined role and status. Teachers resist proposed student changes, downplay students' efforts including the value of student concerns and projects, distribute poor grades to students whose behavior is not properly conciliatory or respectful, and in other ways seek to discourage student initiative to develop and/or maintain a status inconsistent with school personnel's perception of student abilities and/or needs.

A more visible form of undesirable student-school conflict is the act of rejection. In such instances, students reject what the school has to offer and the school rejects the students because of who they are or because of what they do. This form of conflict represents the emergence of active polarization between student and school. It signals the utilization of win-lose strategies which can easily become a loss for both student and school.

Students who reject the school do so in a variety of ways. They actively communicate a distaste for the rules and regulations which govern their participation in classes and extracurricular activites and how and when they associate with other students. Rejecting students focus their attention on the "unfair" behavior of teachers and administrators. They complain of other students who receive undue positive attention and praise; they search for out-of-school activities as a substitute for unrewarding school programs.

In school, rejection takes the form of disrupting classes, fighting with other students, writing graffiti on bathroom walls, consciously and visibly refusing to follow rules and regulations, and using cars on school premises in a hazardous manner. Students' rejection-oriented behaviors make visible the school's failure to reach such students.

School-initiated activities which foster and promote rejection of students include making derogatory comments about non-conforming students; refusing to recognize student efforts; expressing negative attitudes toward student-oriented projects; strictly enforcing minor rules and regulations against rejecting students; detaining students after school for minor infractions; removing students from class on the basis of lack of respect, disruptions, etc.; labeling students in discussion with other students and faculty members; and making poor comparisons between the "better" students and the rejected students.

As older students in colleges and universities have declared their intentions of claiming their rights as citizens, so have their younger brothers and sisters begun to organize to claim their rights as individuals in the public schools. This step toward freedom and rightful ownership of self is reflected in a number of conflicts which exist between students and schools. Students want the opportunity to demonstrate their masculinity, their femininity, their maturity, and their ability to make decisions for themselves. Students have discovered that individual confrontation of the school provides less satisfaction and results than does organizing those who have a common cause in opposition to the schools. Such organized opposition by students, both academically talented and marginally talented, leads to the use of threats; to non-conforming hair and dress styles as distinguishing features of peer groups; to the formation of gangs with norms, codes of conduct, and structure; to groups of students who roam the halls; to the publication of underground newspapers; to common flaunting of rule violations; to the development of visible protest student groups; and to anti-school election campaign platforms. Students' increasing demand for recognition of their rights to freedom of speech and their increasing refusal to acknowledge the school's right to determine matters of moral turpitude and behaviors appropriate for ethnic and minority racial groups often lead to open confrontations in school and recently in the courts.

Such organized opposition on the part of students and student groups has its counterpart among school personnel. There is an informal network among faculty and administrators in most schools which perpetuates the development of myths, stereotypes, fears, and antagonisms to students and student-oriented programs. Faculty are encouraged to accept certain negative beliefs about selected students and student groups. Such beliefs are visible in faculty meetings where voting against students and student-initiated projects often takes place. Members of "undesirable" student groups are frequently suspended and harassed by teachers and administrators. The enforcement of rules on students is a selective matter. Reward systems are developed which exclude identifiable groups of students and which preclude recognition of their achievements. Faculty debates on upholding standards often represent a form of organized opposition to selected student groups.

Where teachers want respect from students, students want involvement from teachers. Where teachers want freedom to evaluate students, students want teacher help and friendly participation. Where teachers want students to demonstrate subserviance, obedience, and humility, students want the opportunity to demonstrate masculinity, femininity, maturity, and an ability to decide for themselves. Such obvious differences in expectations between peer groups and faculty lead inevitably to student-school conflict. Students view efforts to develop symbols, behaviors, and attitudes reflective of their increased maturity as desirable. Teachers, however, experience the development of such symbols as evidence of the existence of a peer group culture over which they have little or no control. The lack of control is a threat to school authority. Student organizations facilitate the use of clothing, hairstyles, and behaviors which emphasize independence and opposition. The use of selected recreational activities provides a form of common identification and constitutes a form of peer group acceptance in lieu of the adult reward system. The incompatibility between a student attempting to "grow up" and a faculty which seeks to have the student remain a child pinpoints a continuing confrontation between students and schools. Further, the phrase, "School would be wonderful if we didn't have any kids," is symbolic of the attitude which leads to conflict between students and schools.

A final stage of undesirable student-school conflict is in the form of destructive confrontation. Polarization is complete. Opportunities for raprochement are minimal, if not non-existent. Student-initiated behaviors revolve around vandalism of school property, physical beatings administered to students and school personnel, arson and attempted arson, the presence and use of all forms of weapons on school premises, and various other forms of assault against persons associated with the schools. The level of hostility which exists at this stage of student-school conflict cannot be minimized. In some instances, the nature of organizational opposition to schools by students amounts to undeclared warfare.

School behaviors which reflect a continuing commitment to win-lose strategy and frequently heighten the nature of the destructive confrontation between student and school include imposing academic sanctions and physical restrictions on students and student groups, making efforts to segregate students based on behavior, officially excluding students from further attendance at school, and conspiring to prevent students from further school achievement and from recognition as school leaders. The level of mistrust is perpetuated by comments and behaviors which reflect a continuing lack of trust and a desire to keep the students from having further contact with schools and school personnel.

Hypotheses About Sources of Student-School Conflict

The following hypotheses relate to sources of student-school conflict. They emerged from: (1) an extrapolation of types of conflict identified by persons interviewed; (2) a review of materials related to various forms of student-school conflict collected by the investigator during and after the interviews; and (3) the investigator's own prior involvement as a school administrator in charge of student discipline and more recent involvement with school personnel in seminars, school faculty workshops, and classes where student-school relations were the subject of discussion and study. The hypotheses represent an attempt to synthesize the thinking about student-school conflict into a few basic statements as a means of focusing further investigations. They provide a way of looking at student-school conflicts in relationship to basic sources of conflict.

HYPOTHESIS #1: STUDENT-SCHOOL CONFLICT IS AN OUTGROWTH OF THE SCHOOL'S EXERCISE OF AUTHORITY AND CONTROL.

Student-school conflict is an outgrowth of the struggle between students and school personnel over who has the right to determine the present and future identity of the student. The school's efforts to make visible and retain its authority over the student on occasions of its choosing stimulates student-school conflict. Student-school conflict highlights both student and school deficiencies and is a factor in reducing legitimacy of either party to control the interaction which takes place between them. Students have need to gain control over those decisions which affect their development, and the school has need to maintain control as a means of imposing its values and goals upon students.

HYPOTHESIS #2: STUDENT-SCHOOL CONFLICT IS AN OUTGROWTH OF EFFORTS TO SECURE STUDENT ACCEPTANCE OF PRE-DETERMINED GOALS, TEACHING METHODS, AND STUDENT ROLES.

Student-school conflict is reflected in conflict over subject matter being taught; teaching techniques used by teachers which tend to foster reduced student self-concept and/or enhance teacher self-concepts; the scarcity of acceptable roles within the school consistent with students' needs, aspirations, and levels of ability; and programmatic commitments of the school itself. Not least of the causes for student-school conflict is student-teacher competition for recognition and status in the school. Legitimate student learning needs frequently serve as a source of confrontation to preferred teaching styles which do not enhance student development.

HYPOTHESIS #3: STUDENT-SCHOOL CONFLICT IS AN OUTGROWTH OF PROCESSES AND STRUCTURES WHICH ARE SELECTIVE IN SUPPORTING STUDENT DEVELOPMENT.

Student-school conflict is an outgrowth of student rejection of school policies and procedures for governing and developing student attitudes and behaviors. It is also an outgrowth of school practices which favor selected student attitudes, behaviors, and activities and hence, discriminate against other student attitudes, behaviors, and activities. Student-school conflict is also an outgrowth of gross school ineffectiveness in responding to legitimate student needs. Student efforts to achieve change and recognition through organizing lead to further student-school conflict. The inadequacy of available structures for focusing on, discussing, and deciding issues of critical importance to both students and school personnel also leads to student-school conflict.

HYPOTHESIS #4: STUDENT-SCHOOL CONFLICT IS AN OUTGROWTH OF INEFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION.

Student-school conflict is an outgrowth of student efforts to communicate feelings and frustrations about school policies and practices. It results from different student-school interpretations of mutually agreed upon practices, procedures, and goals. School size and the depersonalized atmosphere that goes with larger schools contribute to lack of cohesiveness and unity and lead to student-school conflict. Ineffective student-school strategies for communicating and confronting each other about expectations and needs lead to student-school conflict.

Strategies for Managing Student-School Conflicts

Strategies for managing student-school conflict as currently practiced are often placed in the context of schools being right and students being wrong. The concept of innocent until proven guilty often does not apply in schools. Adults are presumed right and students are presumed wrong in most conflict situations. Administrators are placed under heavy pressure by faculty members to support the faculty in any confrontation with students. Except in more enlightened schools, student grievance procedures for processing claims against teachers and administrators do not exist. The model most frequently used for the handling of student-school conflict involves the use of an adversary proceeding without benefit of rules of evidence, fair hearings, and representative counsel. The model, however, is not drawn from the legal profession but is more akin to the personal authoritarian relationships exhibited in many families where "father knows best." In recent years, however, it has been increasingly recognized that students have rights which cannot be invalidated by reason of their being students.

Too, public concern in recent years for child abuse in families and, therefore, child abuse in schools is modifying the traditional conflict management model used in schools.

An unusual aspect of designing strategies for managing student-school conflict is the unequal relationship which exists between individual students and school organizations. Individual students are at a disadvantage in using any strategy other than adjustment, compliance, peaceful protest, and reliance upon the benevolence of the organization and its representatives. Other strategies aimed at achieving changes are apt to be seen as threatening, negative, unwarranted, and ill-advised. Because of this, many, if not most, of the strategies aimed at reducing undesirable student-school conflict places the burden of responsibility upon the school. It is the school that has the resources, the authority, the know-how, and the skills to effect needed changes. There are several major categories of potentially effective strategies for managing student-school conflict. They are: (1) the development and implementation of in-service training programs for school and student personnel; (2) the development of structures for adequately dealing with potentially disruptive conflicts; (3) the utilization of processes to manage conflicts; (4) the modification and adjustment of educational goals and practices which stimulate student-school conflict; and (5) the development of more adequate enforcement procedures for more effectively managing student-school conflict.

Specific strategies related to in-service programs include: (1) training all school personnel to recognize that students need to be helped to acquire a strong positive self-concept; (2) employing professional personnel whose attitudes toward students are positive and supportive; (3) conducting skill development seminars for conflict-prone students and teachers; (4) conducting group discussions with students to facilitate a sense of responsibility for their behavior and to teach them how best to confront the educational system; (5) conducting in-service training programs for school personnel to assist them in changing their values and attitudes toward students who are different; (6) developing sensitizing experiences for both students and school personnel so that each group can be aware of the other's needs and can recognize the repressive disciplinary measures which most frequently stimulate student anger and hatred and lead to student-school conflict; and (7) train students and school personnel in decision making processes which are effective in managing student-school conflict.

The interaction process among and between students and school personnel contributes to student-school conflict. Process strategies which could be effective in reducing undesirable student-school conflict include: (1) better diagnosing and assessing student identity needs; (2) sharing power among interested and involved students and teachers; (3) improving the feedback between students and school personnel regarding sources of dissatisfaction and frustration; (4) involving students and school personnel in developing a student-faculty bill of rights which would govern student-faculty relationships; (5) involving students in creating new territories and roles which can become the basis for student identities; (6) openly discussing in meetings involving both students and faculty the problems of governance, control, and authority; (7) adopting procedures which emphasize consensus decision making and involvement of all groups; (8) adopting procedures for sharing with students evaluative and other information critical to sound decision making; (9) increasing the participation of students in student government activities; (10) increasing the role of student government in the governance of schools; (11) restructuring teacher assignments to insure that teachers are placed in more informal contact situations with students; (12) modifying the attitudes and behaviors of school personnel so as to effectively introduce more humane interaction between students and teachers; and (13) developing a reward system for recognizing the ability of students and school personnel to manage conflict constructively, efficiently, and effectively.

Although structure itself appears to be a major source of student-school conflict, the utilization of structure can be an appropriate strategy for more effectively managing student-school conflict. Critical in this regard is the development of structures which allow all people to have access to the decision-making process. Creating a position, such as an ombudsman, would facilitate student and faculty expression of frustration and dissatisfaction. It would also be seen as an acceptable means of expressing feelings. Joint fact-finding bodies could be established to identify problems and conflicts prior to and after conflict has emerged. The size of operating school units could be decreased to improve unity and cohesiveness among students and school personnel. A system of school courts involving students and school personnel could be developed to manage student-school conflict. School rules governing student behavior based on school-wide referenda could be adopted. Codes of conduct for teachers and administrators should be developed as a means of governing their behavior in relationship to students. A school council would help the educational climate within a given school where the focus is on constructive rather than negative aspects of student-school encounters. Vehicles which facilitate quick corrective confrontations between students and school personnel involved in a conflict are needed. Alternative school programs are needed to accommodate the more unusual needs of students, and a holding room where students and/or teachers could go to dissipate the tensions and frustrations is needed.

Effective management of student-school conflict could be enhanced through the development of strategies related to educational goals and related programming. In this category, more territories need to be defined and made available to students as a basis of establishing new identities; curricula and programs should be modified so that students are not totally dependent upon an achievement orientation as a means of acquiring an identity; a student-school curriculum council should be developed for purposes of reviewing, modifying, and approving classes and courses of study prior to submission to the Board of Education for final approval; the lock-step approach used in many schools for promoting and educating students should be eliminated in favor of more flexible learning arrangements; student courses of study should be flexible enough to allow for work activities; recreational activities, in addition to study activities and courses related to value clarification and the role of law in the social order should be added.

Conflict management strategies for managing student-school conflict have so far placed an emphasis upon necessary modifications, adjustments, and improvement in the relationship between students and school. It must be recognized that there are some situations in which positive approaches will be less than successful. In such approaches, the question of strategies related to enforcement come to the fore. In this regard, the employment and training of security personnel for each school receive a high priority. The installation of electronic surveillance systems for use as an early warning system for crimes about to be committed should be considered; the use of television monitors located around a school facility could be increased; and students and teachers could be provided with identification cards so ready identification of personnel could be made.

Potential Effectiveness of Suggested Strategies for Managing Student-School Conflict

Those strategies seen as more effective in managing student-school conflict are closely related to producing conditions which, if in existence, would have precluded the development of student-school conflict in the first place. As such, effective strategies are not quick response vehicles or panaceas. Rather, they are those strategies which reflect a concern for the needs of students and the expectations of school personnel and which focus on the modification of attitudes, behaviors, and programs. They are expensive in terms of personal commitments, use of time, development of meaningful relationships through structure development, process improvement, and mutual goal development. They highlight equality of relations and respect for differences. They accept the need of the student to become and the teacher's responsibility to help in that process. They focus primarily on the task of growth and development as opposed to enforcement of rules, regulations, and procedures. They accept the uniqueness and individuality of students and school personnel and the inevitability of conflict arising out of human beings interacting with other human beings.

Central to any effective conflict management strategy is a balance between appreciating the emotional and psychological needs of students and teachers in the context of an increasingly impersonal educational setting. As such, effective conflict management strategies incorporate involvement, equality, acceptance, discussion, joint decision making, minimal use of authority, the development of student and faculty expertise in analysis and diagnosis, and the increase in roles, territories, and activities which can stimulate the development and acceptance of individual student and school personnel identities.

CHAPTER IV

SCHOOL-COMMUNITY CONFLICT

Introduction

Undesirable school-community conflict frequently involves social, economic, legal, political, religious, educational, and racial concerns. Conflicts range from localized skirmishes involving a few citizens and school personnel to major confrontations involving most community members and organizations, the total school system, and state and federal agencies.

Specifically, the focus of such conflict often relates to (1) the allocation and distribution of economic and human resources, (2) the educational goals and objectives as they relate to community values and norms, (3) organizational policies and procedures for implementing school system programs, (4) the effectiveness and acceptability of school personnel, (5) the quality of education provided students in terms of their needs and expectations, (6) the ability and willingness of the school to meet community expectations, and (7) the role of conflict itself as a means of facilitating needed growth and change in the school system.

Assumptions

The diversity of expectations citizens have for their schools leads inevitably to conflict. These expectations are imbedded in the assumptions people make about the purpose of schools and how these purposes should be fulfilled. Professional personnel also have expectations and assumptions about the purpose and function of the schools. When these expectations are incongruent, the potential for conflict is great. Special community interests also have expectations which place unique responsibilities on the schools. School and community assumptions, often contrary to each other, which can be identified include: (1) Schools are responsible for maintaining social stability and the status quo; (2) Schools are responsible for preparing selected students for admission to the more prestigious roles in society; (3) Schools are responsible as a screening agency for preventing the unfit, the troublemaker, and the irresponsible student from entering the mainstream of American social and economic life; (4) Schools are responsible for helping all students develop their abilities to the fullest extent; (5) Schools are responsible for providing the business community with well educated and willing workers; (6) Schools are responsible for upholding the community's identity in competition with other communities; (7) Schools are responsible for helping minority group students improve their acceptability, status, and roles in the community; and (8) Schools are responsible for providing students with the resourcefulness and skills necessary to change unfair social norms and practices.

Forms of Undesirable School-Community Conflict

School-community conflict often focuses on a specific issue. The conflicts, however, frequently involve many people and their concerns.

It is helpful, therefore, to identify, for purposes of clarification, major areas of concern which lead to school-community conflict. These include (1) values and beliefs held by community members, (2) the availability and allocation of resources to the schools, (3) the decision-making process used by board members, administrators, teachers, and other school personnel, (4) current social and political issues in which the schools become involved, (5) educational practices which are at variance with local custom and tradition, (6) the unfair treatment of students by school personnel, and (7) the behavior of the professional staff.

Specific issues related to community values and beliefs around which conflict often revolves includes, among others, the place of religion and religious practices in the school, the involvement of local politics in school affairs, the neighborhood school concept, the teaching of racial and sexual biases and discriminatory practices, and the use of selected novels involving offensive themes and words.

Issues related to the availability and allocation of resources often include the building of new facilities, including their location; tax increases for purposes of increasing teacher pay; the number of highly-paid professional administrators and other service personnel employed; the competition between schools and other governmental agencies for scarce tax dollars; and the development of programs to serve different student populations.

Decision making, the process of making choices among often undesirable alternatives, leads to conflict. The manner in which boards of education hold meetings, make decisions, conduct hearings, and relate to administrative personnel, and the manner in which decisions are made within the system itself are latent conflict issues. Social issues such as desegregation, busing, the equal rights amendment, Title IX, abortion, child abuse, terrorism, corruption and graft in public office, the misuse of welfare programs, and other issues which the school chooses to discuss and become involved with are all critically examined by members of the community and often becomes the focus of school-community conflict.

Educational issues, including new programs and processes, are often the source of school-community conflict. The use of open classrooms, open space, individualized learning, behavior modification techniques, programmed learning, the failure to teach phonics, the lack of reading skills, the amount of homework assigned, the role of the three R's in the curriculum, programs for exceptional children, and outmoded curricula are examples of issues around which school-community conflict evolves.

The behavior of students and how it is dealt with by administrators and teachers are sources of perennial conflict between school and community. Consistently, this area of disagreement has stimulated more conflict than most other areas. Punishment reflects direct action against a specific student and affects a particular family but has broader implications. The use of techniques such as spanking, detentions, suspensions, and the exclusion of students is acceptable to some parents, but perceived as a direct threat to the student's future, livelihood, and place in society by other parents.

The behavior of professional staff members is under constant scrutiny by the community: parents discuss and express opinions about a teacher's ability to teach and whether an administrator is able to administer. The ethical and moral behavior of school personnel, including their sexual, social, and economic lifestyles, and, in some communities, their religious and political affiliations, becomes the subject of school-community dissention.

Specific forms of undesirable school-community conflict include: (1) voter rejection of tax and bond referenda; (2) the formation of anti-school citizen groups; (3) mass community protest meetings against school practices; (4) misleading newspaper advertisements about school programs; (5) community demonstration marches against school practices; (6) harassment, threats, and bodily injury to school personnel; (7) boycott of classes by students and parents and withdrawing of students from school; (8) disruptive citizen participation at school board meetings; (9) the circulation and filing of recall petitions for school board members and/or elected school personnel; (10) mass media and governmental investigations of school practices; (11) public censure of school district fiscal practices by local governmental units; (12) manipulation of schools by political groups to further self-interests; (13) lack of cooperation between school and community agencies over use of physical facilities for community and recreational purposes; (14) tort liability suits against school personnel; (15) manipulation of students and/or school personnel for illegal, unethical, or detrimental purposes; (16) closing schools arbitrarily without opportunity for discussion and agreement among school personnel and community groups; (17) continued use of instructional materials offensive to community groups; (18) community refusal to cooperate in changing attendance boundary-lines and transferring students required by law and court orders; (19) school practices which knowingly violate the integrity of religious, ethnic, and/or cultural norms of minority groups and individual students; (20) parental dissatisfaction with and subversion of programs which are aimed at improving educational opportunities for minority group students; and (21) the lack of honest communication between school and community related to unresolved issues.

Hypotheses About Sources of School-Community Conflict

School-community conflict is a measure of the imbalance which exists between community support and expectations and school needs and behaviors as interpreted by school and community persons. The sources of school-community conflict appear to be as diverse as the forms of conflict which exist. Communities are rarely homogeneous in all respects. They frequently consist of multitudes of organizations with diverse goals and overlapping memberships. They often possess a positive image and have educational expectations difficult to meet at best and impossible at worst. There is no easy way to efficiently and effectively fulfill all of a community's expectations, many of them in opposition to each other, without violating a contrary set of expectations. Hence, the conflicts in which communities and schools are involved often relate to divergent expectations which, when unfulfilled, lead to conflict. The interface among students, school, and community is frequently a battleground of interests aimed at establishing, maintaining, and increasing the acceptance of a group's unique identity by other parties to the conflict. The interface is also directed toward securing the resources necessary for selected groups of students, parents, and citizens to lead a better life or to have a more effective school or a more prestigious community.

The competitive struggles for organizational position, social affiliation, and economic power are often directed toward controlling or replacing the established power structures in the school or community and toward controlling or influencing policy-making processes which affect the community and its members. The following hypotheses about school-community conflict emerged from (1) the examples of school-community conflict identified by persons interviewed who were familiar with school controversies in London, Boston, Charlotte—Mecklinburg, San Francisco, Detroit, St. Louis, and Los Angeles, (2) a review of materials made available to the investigator related to school-community conflicts, and (3) the investigator's own direct recent involvement with parents, teachers, and administrators in the Palo Alto, Eugene, Durham County, Louisville, Indianapolis, Knoxville, Oak Ridge, Reidsville, and Jefferson County Schools. The hypotheses represent synthesized major sources of school-community conflict. It is in this context that the following hypotheses about the sources of school-community conflict are suggested.

HYPOTHESIS #1: SCHOOL-COMMUNITY CONFLICT IS AN OUTGROWTH OF THE SCHOOL'S FAILURE TO HELP ALL STUDENTS ACQUIRE APPROPRIATE SKILLS, KNOWLEDGE, ATTITUDES, AND BEHAVIORS WHICH ARE NEEDED TO ACHIEVE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC SUCCESS.

Community members have expectations for what schools are to do and how they are to do it. In this regard, communities are especially sensitive to school processing of community sentiments and preferences. They analyze, up close and from a distance, how school personnel perform their roles. They are often convinced that schools are biased and discriminating in their practices against selected members of the student body as well as for selected members of the student body. Data gathered by school personnel related to student achievement, the inability of students to find suitable jobs, the lack of demonstrable basic skills such as reading, writing, and filling out forms, and the lack of interest in available job opportunities have convinced many community groups that the schools are failing.

HYPOTHESIS #2: SCHOOL-COMMUNITY CONFLICT IS AN OUTGROWTH OF THE COMMUNITY'S LACK OF SUPPORT OF SCHOOL POLICIES, PROGRAMS, AND PROCEDURES.

Visible differences between community-held values and school-implemented values are reflected in school-community conflicts. School values which are significantly different from community values create uncertainty, suspicion, and mistrust and leads to a lack of community support. These differences also reduce the community's internalized commitment to public education and the school's willingness to provide quality education, especially when funds are scarce. At such times, private goals appear more important for both citizens and school personnel.

When communities fail to support special school programs or to provide adequate resources for the schools, conflict occurs in the form of teacher resignations, teacher resistance to "parental interference," teacher opposition to non-paid supervision of extracurricular activities and other non-cooperative acts. The mutuality of relations gives way to controversial program curtailment, polarization of views, and the use of harassment tactics to embarass, discredit, "get even," and otherwise hinder the other party's objectives. The presence of school-community conflict is visible evidence of poor communication and disagreement among important segments of the school community over critical issues. Any lack of community support which threatens the schools' organizational stability or the role of key school personnel will inevitably result in school-community conflict.

HYPOTHESIS #3: SCHOOL-COMMUNITY CONFLICT IS AN OUTGROWTH OF INEFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION BETWEEN SCHOOL PERSONNEL AND COMMUNITY MEMBERS ABOUT THEIR NEEDS AND EXPECTATIONS.

Communicating effectively between school and community becomes a difficult problem as schools increase in size and become more impersonal. Communication is also hindered when school personnel do not live in the community, when school procedures become ritualized, and when personal access to school officials is perceived as difficult. At such times, school personnel are perceived as less caring, and the responsibility for facilitating effective school-community communication is transferred to third parties such as the mass media, including newspapers, radio, and television. The history of such communication efforts continues to demonstrate that the more volatile and negative aspects of concerns and issues are transmitted by such media.[76] The disappearance of close home and school ties reduces the mechanisms for communicating more positive dimensions of school-community related interests.

---

[76] See Richard F. Carter, Voters and Their Schools, for an extended discussion of this point.

HYPOTHESIS #4: SCHOOL-COMMUNITY CONFLICT IS AN OUTGROWTH OF EFFORTS TO IDENTIFY ISSUES, CLARIFY GOALS, AND MARSHALL SUPPORT FOR EDUCATIONAL CHANGE.

The history of school-community relations is one of apathy until a crisis develops. At such times, the energy necessary to manage and/or resolve the conflict emerges. One means of facilitating needed changes is to stimulate sufficient conflict so as to sharpen issues and achieve movement toward new goals and objectives. The inability of people to live with uncertainty and discrepancies is a force which contributes to change. School-community conflict which generates significant school-community interaction functions to bring several perspectives to bear on relevant issues, including the clarification of goals and issues and the development of community support needed to institute changes in school programs and policies.

HYPOTHESIS #5: SCHOOL-COMMUNITY CONFLICT IS AN OUTGROWTH OF INDIRECT EFFORTS TO MANAGE COMMUNITY CONFLICTS REVOLVING AROUND THE EXPENDITURE OF TAX DOLLARS, THE DISTRIBUTION OF POWER WITHIN THE COMMUNITY, THE DEVELOPMENT OF CONTROL MECHANISMS, AND THE DETERMINATION OF VALUES WHICH WILL GOVERN COMMUNITY POLICY MATTERS.

The school is an important social and educational agency in the community. The resources and aspirations of citizens are closely tied to school decisions which affect the lives of their children and themselves. No other community agency affects the emotional concerns of its citizens as regularly as do the schools. Because of this, the future of the community is directly affected by the actions of the public school system and what happens to that system. Further, the decisions on many social, economic, environmental, and political issues affecting the community are controlled by agencies not accessible or responsive to local community pressures. Because the schools are a ready-made vehicle for getting the attention of citizens and citizen groups, school-community issues are often used as a vehicle for managing community conflicts related to tax dollars, public housing, and other matters. In this regard, then, some school-community conflicts are minimally related to basic educational issues and school practices.

Strategies for Managing School-Community Conflict

School-community conflict has the potential for being extremely complex. It represents a constantly shifting confrontation involving individuals and groups representing a variety of vested interests. Above all, it represents conflict in which boundaries are often ill-defined, the territory contested, and management mechanisms unclear. It usually involves a community where citizens have different values, norms, ethic and racial backgrounds and are divided as to their expectations for the schools. The schools can frequently be characterized as having a definable organization, possessing a legal standing, being responsible for performing certain educational functions for the community, and being quite dependent upon that community for both students and the financial resources needed to educate them. These two entities represent quite different systems. The initial advantage in any confrontation depends upon the community. It is a wedding of unequal partners with unequal responsibilities in which one partner (the community) must organize before it can confront and the other partner (the school) must restrain its confrontation in order to survive as an organization.

Conflict between school and community is less a matter of interpreting established guidelines governing the relationship than that of developing guidelines for use in any on-going conflict. In general, the community tends to control financial resources, availability of students, the distribution of power, and the norms under which schools must function. Schools, on the other hand, tend to be well organized, have a higher level of expertise, have a legal responsibility for educating students, are highly visible, and have been legitimized by local, state, and federal authorities.

Strategies may be grouped into categories based upon the processes involved. Broadly speaking, these processes include (1) communication, (2) involvement, (3) legislation, (4) public meetings, (5) structured interactions, (6) judicial processes, and (7) forceful interventions.

Communication. Specific communication strategies for managing undesirable school-community conflict include (1) disseminating information upon which realistic expectations for community support of the schools can be developed, (2) identifying and publicizing school needs to community groups, (3) developing a system for evaluating community attitudes toward school policies and practices, (4) securing feedback from parents and other community groups about school efficiency and effectiveness, (5) maintaining close relationships between teachers and parents, (6) maintaining close liaison with representatives of the mass media, and (7) developing a reporting system which will allow school personnel to accurately and systematically describe the problems, the success, and the concerns of the school to parents and the community.

Involvement. Involvement strategies utilize community information and feedback in developing, maintaining, and changing school programs as needed. To facilitate this, citizens and parents should be involved in all school activities, including (1) defining goals and objectives, (2) planning developmental activities related to school programs, and (3) developing programs for meeting the needs of parents, elderly citizens, and other persons in their post-high school years. Schools and school personnel should be trained (1) to work effectively with community groups, (2) to develop an attitude of responsiveness to community feedback and needs, (3) to follow a practice of recruiting and employing members of minority groups for school positions, and (4) to discontinue those "professional" practices which unnecessarily alienate parents and citizens. Involving community members in substantive and procedural school issues reduces the potential for undesirable school-community conflict.

Legislation. Legislative strategies can be most effective in managing school-community conflicts where the parties involved accept the authority of the legislative body (i.e., school board, county court, city council, state board of education) to establish policies governing the issues or respect the fairness of decisions reached and implemented.

Typical conflict management strategies related to school-community conflict that are legislative in nature include (1) the development of policy statements, (2) the approval of administrative decisions, and (3) gathering data prior to making and implementing a decision. Policies which are intended to reduce school-community conflict frequently relate to employment practices, the allocation of resources, transportation of students to facilitate desegregation, attendance zones, administrative decision making, program innovations, control of students, and teacher evaluation.

Public Meetings. Public meetings can help manage school-community conflict effectively if used properly. They can also generate considerable conflict. They are potentially volatile, and the direction they take is a function of the organizer's planning and expertise.

Public meetings provide a visible forum for the simultaneous exchange of views. Public meetings are frequently covered by the media and events are communicated quickly to the rest of the community. The value of this strategy lies in its ability to generate support for action or to defuse an issue by exposing it to full public view. Criticial elements of the strategy include (1) time of meeting, (2) place of meeting, (3) adequacy of the sound system, (4) agenda to be followed, including sequence of items to be discussed, (5) length of meeting, (6) process to be followed in developing and discussing various points of view, (7) competency of chairperson in monitoring and responding to emotions, issues, and pressures, and (8) reaching conclusions acceptable to those affected by the issues.

Intervention Techniques. The use of intervention techniques to manage school-community conflict involves (1) the use of respected and neutral third parties to poll the community about school policies and programs and to survey the schools to determine educational needs, and (2) the use of a school-community coordinating council to (a) disseminate information about the schools, (b) conduct public discussion about school issues, (c) help interpret school needs and programs to the community, (d) represent the community's concerns to the schools, and (e) develop appropriate processes to be followed in managing school-community conflicts.

Judicial Proceedings. The use of judicial processes is always available to community members and members of the school system in the event conflicts cannot be managed in any other satisfactory manner. Such strategies include suits and countersuits, injunctions, depositions, recall petitions, restraining orders, attorney general's opinions, grand jury investigations, and indictments.

The use of judicial proceedings commonly reflects a lack of trust between school and community, a polarization of vested interests, and the acceptance of a win-lose adversary relationship. The use of judicial proceedings, whether related to the school's discipline policies or busing to achieve desegregation, although at times necessary, tends to create animosities and damages relations for years to come. The use of judicial proceedings represents an appeal to a more formal process and a value system which is perceived as potentially more understanding and responsive.

Force. The use of force as a strategy for managing school-community conflict is usually undesirable. It is, however, necessary under some conditions. Such conditions appear to involve the immediate or potential destruction of public property, the infliction of bodily harm on school and community personnel, and the unauthorized control of facilities and equipment for unlawful purposes. Specific strategies involving the use of force include (1) the massive use of police and military personnel to control the behavior of individuals, groups, and mobs intent on destructive acts, and (2) the regular employment of police personnel to maintain surveillance and control over school-community events.

Potential Effectiveness of Suggested Strategies for Managing School-Community Conflict

Evaluating school-community conflict management strategies as to their effectiveness is difficult. In specific instances, such as the passage of a bond or tax referendum, the re-election of a board member, or community approval of a controversial contract with the teacher's union, the strategies used by proponents of each issue can be viewed as functionally effective in terms of reaching an immediate goal. However, the residual impact of the outcome upon future school-community relations is also critical. School-community relations is a state of mind, a level of confidence, an attitude of goodwill and support. The principle of "everyone needs to win" while common sense in nature, is an important criteria for measuring the effectiveness of conflict management strategies in school-community relations.

Effective school-community conflict management strategies will be characterized by (1) efforts to identify the problem inherent in the conflict, (2) efforts to differentiate between the needs of individuals who are involved and the issues at conflict, (3) efforts to keep the conflict focused on the issues in a conflict as opposed to the behavior of participants, (4) the involvement of relevant persons whose attitudes will inevitably affect the outcome of the conflict, (5) a concern for the well being and integrity of conflict participants, (6) processes which can be learned quickly and relatively easily by school and community personnel, (7) use of resources which are relatively inexpensive in terms of time, dollars, and expenditure of energy, (8) the strategy's overall potential for managing current conflict efficiently and effectively, and (9) a concern for improving the school-community's ability to manage similar conflicts in the future.

The specific school-community strategies which appear to best meet the criteria for effectiveness include communication, involvement, and legislation. In each instance, an effective strategy is one which takes into consideration the needs, motives, pressures, resources, and abilities of the persons involved, the situational constraints and variables which affect the participants and subsequently produce an outcome capable of minimizing losses and maximizing gains for all participants.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Conflict is an integral part of life in America. It is reflected in the system of checks and balances of governments, in the competition of business for markets, between labor and management for scarce resources, in the proliferation of competitive sports events, in the selective admission policies of colleges and universities, and in the distribution to individuals of rewards, favors, and statuses of all kinds. It permeates the thinking of educators and affects the learning of children. Indeed, conflict is a cornerstone of the American way of life. The failure of some individuals to succeed in this context is viewed as an acceptable cost of maintaining the system. It serves to punish the less competitive and reward the more aggressive persons. It places a high emphasis upon winning at any cost and defines success in easily quantifiable terms - the score, money earned, positions held, or goods owned. Conflict is viewed as a pathological phenomenon only when it is exhibited in socially unacceptable forms, when it becomes uncontrollable, or when it is used by persons not sanctioned by existing power holders. Conflict has been a positive factor in bringing about needed change even as it has produced significant social casualties.

Conflict which is perceived as undesirable in student-student, student-school, and school-community relations is the focus of this report. Undesirable educational conflicts analyzed in this report are a reflection of conflicts in our society. Student-student conflicts mirror adult-adult conflicts. Student-school conflicts are similar to the undesirable relations which exist between citizens and the organizations they have created. School-community conflict is a microcosm of the broader national and international conflicts which remain unregulated and uncontrolled.

Schools constitute an important American social institution where children and youth interface with different people, ideas, and traditions. This interface occurs during a period of rapid intellectual, emotional, and physical growth and results naturally in conflict. Evidence of the instability of this interface is reflected in the vast array of public and private agencies which have been created to monitor, mediate, and control the resulting conflict. Such agencies include police departments, mental health centers, half-way houses, juvenile detention homes, juvenile courts, job corps, drug rehabilitation centers, sex clinics, and suicide centers. School counselors, psychiatrists, social workers, judges, policemen, and vice-principals in charge of discipline can all attest to the on-going conflict experienced by youth, much of it in a school context.

Students, like schools, have unique and individual needs. The needs of students are related to growth and development, personal experimentation, social exploration, and most of all, the acquisition of an identity. It is in meeting these needs that students develop the capacity to function effectively as productive citizens. The process of influencing and controlling their environment is an integral part of this fulfillment. Conflict is inevitable when students are thwarted in their efforts to meet these needs.

Simultaneously, schools have a need for order and stability, material resources, a clear sense of purpose, and an assurance of their place in the social order. Schools have been created as social institutions to facilitate student growth. In some cases they have been given authority to direct this process in an enlightened manner. In other situations, they have been relegated to the role of a custodial agency. In few cases, however, have schools received the latitude or exercised their perogatives to develop non-competitive, conflict-free alternative educational programs for students. Such programs are frequently viewed by teachers with suspicion as a negative evaluation of their instructional effectiveness. Resolving the ambiguity of providing fully for the needs of individual students and meeting the expectations of an adult society constitutes a troublesome, but continuing, need of schools.

Community needs are diverse and often incompatible. Commonly held expectations frequently relate to maximizing student learning opportunities at minimal cost with little, if any, disruption to the community in ways that bring credit and honor to the community. Individual citizen expectations just as frequently emphasize goals that require unequal distribution of resources, establishing programmatic priorities and selectively enhancing the education of some students over other students. Recognizing and fulfilling community needs is difficult and often involves considerable conflict.

In the competitive social framework which exists, the ultimate responsibility for surviving and succeeding rests with the student. The authority to govern that process, however, rests with the schools. The aspirations of parents rise and fall as the educational encounter between students and schools proceeds. The essential ambiguity of this encounter frequently contributes to undesirable student-student, student-school, and school-community conflict. Also, as people with human needs, cultural values, and vested interests interact, differences arise and conflicts emerge. Efforts to moderate and reconcile these conflicts often leads to the assignment of priorities and an allocation of resources. Insensitive decisions here can also lead to further undesirable conflict.

The maintenance of school controls based on a model of parental authority where teachers and administrators are substitute parents is in trouble. Educators who have acquired vested interest in a "parenting" role are in conflict with the emerging needs of students to become adults at an even earlier age. The growing awareness by students of their role and its importance through peer groups, the mass media, and other experiences is leading to a resistance to arbitrary forms of control if not to an acceptance of greater individual responsibility. Other models which recognize this emerging awareness of youth are needed, models which recognize the need for student self-determination, the availability of information, and the interdependence of students.

Student conflict takes many forms. It is often reflected in a sense of dissatisfaction or unfulfilled expectations. It frequently is an outgrowth of (1) student efforts to acquire an acceptable identity, (2) the expression of individual feelings, values, aspirations, and fears, (3) competition for desirable roles, relationships, services, products, and rewards, and (4) support by adults as a means of developing survival traits and skills. Student-student conflict often involves behaviors such as manipulating, stereotyping, humiliating, competing excessively, fighting, segregating, coercing, and nonconforming. In each instance, the form of conflict is related to student needs. In many instances the exhibited behavior is consistent with established group norms but does not produce mutually satisfactory results. Simultaneous perpetuation and rejection of differences among students leads to further conflict, much of it uncontrolled and undesirable.

Strategies and combinations of strategies for managing undesirable student-student conflict are numerous. Avoidance strategies are used by students to avoid, minimize, or restrict their involvement in conflict. The focus is primarily related to self-survival and conservation-maintenance of resources and options. Avoidance strategies oriented toward self-survival include withdrawal and displacement. Similar strategies oriented toward conservation and maintenance of the students' resources include repression, conciliation, and resistance. Approach strategies involve actively confronting people or situations in an effort to either control people or to solve problems. Approach strategies focusing on control include threats, manipulation, coercion, deterrents, and physical aggression. Approach strategies related primarily to problem solving include isolation of issues, fact finding, smoothing, confrontation, mediation, and compromise.

Student-school conflict is initiated by students as well as by teachers and administrators. This type of conflict is usually more complex than student-student conflicts. It involves a conflict between representatives of social systems, often with different vested interests. At the heart of much student-school conflict is an effort to control or regulate the growth and development process of students. Students strive to maximize control over their own growth and development even as school personnel insist that this is their perogative. Student expectations focus on their needs and how the school can help them achieve their goals. School expectations relate less to fulfilling individual student needs than to meeting broadly defined educational goals determined by policy makers and educational personnel. Briefly, student-school conflict is related to (1) the exercise of authority and control, (2) the establishment and acceptance of school-imposed goals, (3) the processes and structures established by schools to govern student behavior, and (4) the ineffective communication between school and students. The resulting undesirable conflict assumes the form of passive involvement, withdrawal, active resistance, rejection, organized opposition, destructive confrontations, and other behaviors. These behaviors are characterized by lack of mutual respect, inability to communicate effectively, misunderstanding, an inability to negotiate effectively, the development of adversary relations, an increased polarization and self-justification. Students want help, acceptance, involvement, and an opportunity to make decisions and to demonstrate their maturity. Teachers want respect, obedience, humility, and order. The increased frequency with which students and schools are in conflict highlight the on-going rejection of these opposing values, attitudes, and behaviors by both students and school personnel.

Effective strategies for managing student-school conflicts must take into account the separate and unequal conditions which most frequently govern the relationship between students and school personnel. In any conflict, schools are usually accorded the status of being right until proven wrong while the opposite is true for students. Several conflict management models appear to be operating simultaneously in the schools. These include a quasi-adversary system without benefit of representation and rules of evidence, a parental authority model requiring few, if any, systematic procedures, and a judicial review system leading to suspension or expulsion.

Managing undesirable student-school conflict involves (1) re-educating faculty and administrators, (2) developing structures for more adequately dealing with potential conflicts, (3) using more effective conflict management processes, (4) modifying or adjusting the educational goals and practices which govern school attitudes and behaviors, and (5) developing more effective enforcement procedures for use when needed.

A review of current strategies for managing student-school conflict needs to be undertaken with a view towards developing more equitable processes.

The most complex conflict of those discussed is school-community conflict. The number and diversity of agencies and people involved contributes to this. The lack of a common regulatory agency or commonly accepted goal usually precludes simple solutions to school-community conflict. School-community conflicts are perceived as an outgrowth of (1) the school's failure to help all students gain skills, attitudes, and behaviors necessary to achieve social and economic success, (2) the community's lack of support of school policies, programs, and procedures, (3) the failure of school personnel and community members and groups to communicate adequately regarding their needs and expectations, (4) the effort to identify issues, clarify goals, and marshall support for educational change, and (5) the indirect efforts to manage community conflicts revolving around tax dollars, power, control, and values.

Undesirable school-community conflicts include anti-school voter behavior, community protest movements, anti-school mass media campaigns, political reprisals, and community action to restrict financial resources and support available to the schools. Government investigations, enforcement of Federal legislation and regulations, and legal action by citizens and citizen groups represent a higher order of school-community conflict in which the decision-making authority of local officals has been suspended, if only temporarily.

Attempts to better manage school-community conflict must take into consideration the more complex nature of such conflicts. School-community conflict often relates to the use of economic and human resources, the relation of educational goals to community values, school policies and procedures, behavior of school personnel, the quality of education provided students, school responsiveness to community needs, and the form and focus of conflict itself. The potential seriousness of these school-community conflicts and the lack of readily accepted final authorities tends to place a premium on the following strategies: communication, citizen involvement, drafting of new legislation, conducting public meetings and forums, the use of mediators, judicial proceedings, and, in some cases, force.

Effective conflict management strategies inevitably involve changing, modifying, or in some way impacting (1) people, (2) processes, (3) goals, or (4) resources. Situational characteristics must be studied carefully in selecting a strategy that will prove to be effective in managing an undesirable conflict. Effective conflict management strategies (1) are easily learned by potential adversaries, (2) are readily available when needed, (3) are relatively inexpensive to use, (4) are acceptable to the parties in conflict, (5) tend to maximize local control over the conflict, (6) more frequently produce win-win solutions, (7) focus on solving problems, (8) help clarify situations which are conflict producing, (9) accept differences as a part of the solution, (10) emphasize mutual goals rather than procedures, (11) minimize statements and behaviors which place blame, and (12) maximize involvement of conflicting parties.

Effective conflict management strategies also more frequently (1) produce creative solutions to problems, (2) maximize satisfaction of participants, (3) create a climate for future resolution of differences, (4) recognize the uniqueness of each conflict, and (5) function effectively within the limits and constraints which govern the situation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Argyris, Chris. *Intervention Theory and Method: A Behavioral Science View*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1970.

Argyris, Chris, and Donald A. Schon. *Theory in Practice: Increasing Professional Effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1974.

Bach, George R., and Peter Wyden. *The Intimate Enemy: How To Fight Fair In Love and Marriage*. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1969.

Bennis, Warren G., Kenneth D. Benne, and Robert Chin, eds. *The Planning of Change*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1969.

Boulding, Kenneth E. *Conflict and Defense: A General Theory*. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.

_______. *A Primer on Social Dynamics; History as Dialectics and Development*. New York: Free Press, 1970.

Bracey, Meier Rudwick. *Conflict and Competition: Studies in the Recent Black Protest Movement*. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1971.

Bruner, Jerome S. *The Process of Education*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960.

Burton, John W. *Conflict and Communication*. New York: Free Press, 1969.

Carter, Richard F. *Voters and Their Schools*. Stanford: Stanford University, 1960.

Chase, Stuart. *Roads to Agreement: Successful Methods in the Science of Human Relations*. New York: Harper and Row, 1951.

Corwin, Ronald G. *Education in Crises: A Sociological Analysis of Schools and Universities in Transition*. New York: Wiley and Company, 1974.

Coser, Lewis A. *Continuities in the Study of Social Conflict*. New York: Free Press, 1967.

_______. *The Functions of Social Conflict*. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1956.

Crozier, Brian. *A Theory of Conflict*. New York: Scribner's, 1974.

Dahrendorf, Ralf. *Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1959.

DeCecco, John T., and Arlene K. Richards. *Growing Pains: Uses of School Conflict*. New York: Aberdeen Press, 1974.

DeReuck, Anthony and Julie Knight, eds *Conflict in Society*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1966.

Deutsch, Morton. *The Resolution of Conflict: Constructive and Destructive Processes*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1973.

Dewey, John. *The Child and the Curriculum, and the School and Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956.

Duke, James T. *Conflict and Power in Social Life*. Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University Press, 1976.

Erikson, Erik H. *Childhood and Society*. New York: Norton, 1964.

_______. *Identity, Youth, and Crisis*. New York: Norton, 1968.

_______. *Youth: Change and Challenge*. New York: Basic Books, 1963.

Festinger, Leon. *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson and Company, 1957.

Filley, Alan C. *Inter-personal Conflict Resolution*. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1975.

Fish, Kenneth L. *Conflict and Dissent in the High Schools*. New York: Bruce Publishing Company, 1970.

Full, Harold. *Controversy in American Education: An Anthology of Crucial Issues*. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1967.

Glasser, William. *The Identity Society*. New York: Harper and Row, 1972.

_______. *Reality Therapy, A New Approach to Psychiatry*. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

_______. *Schools Without Failure*. New York: Harper and Row, 1969.

Gorton, Richard A. *Conflict, Controversy and Crisis in School Administration and Supervision: Issues, Cases, and Concepts for the '70's*. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, 1972.

Hendrick, Irving G. Student Dissent in the Schools. Boston: Houghton: Mifflin, 1972.

Holt, John. How Children Fail. New York: Pitman, 1964.

Horney, Karen. Our Inner Conflicts: A Constructive Theory of Neurosis. New York: W.N. Norton and Company, 1945.

Hutchins, Robert M. The Conflict in Education in a Democratic Society. New York: Harper, 1953.

Kahn, Robert L., and Elise Boulding, eds. Power and Conflict in Organizations. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1964.

Karrass, Chester Louis. The Negotiating Game. New York: World Publishing Company, 1970.

Kaufman, Bel. Up The Down Staircase. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1965.

Keniston, Kenneth. The Uncommitted: Alienated Youth in American Society. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1965.

Kriesberg, Louis. The Sociology of Social Conflicts. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1973.

Lenski, Gerhard E. Human Societies; A Macrolevel Introduction to Sociology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Lewin, Kurt. Resolving Social Conflicts, Selected Papers on Group Dynamics, 1935-1946. New York: Harper, 1958.

Likert, Rensis. New Patterns of Management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

Likert, Rensis, and Jane Gibson Likert. New Ways of Managing Conflict. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.

McClelland, David. Power: The Inner Experience. New York: Irvington Publishers, 1975.

McNeil, Elton B., ed. The Nature of Human Conflict. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.

Marcus, Sheldon, and Harry N. Rivlin, ed. Conflicts in Urban Education. New York: Basic Books, 1970.

Mills, C. Wright. The Sociological Imagination. New York: Oxford University Press, 1959.

Mosca, Gaetano. The Ruling Class. Trans. Hanna D. Kahn. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1939.

Mudd, Stuart, ed. Conflict Resolution and World Education. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1967.

Nye, Robert D. Conflict Among Humans. New York: Springer Publishing Company, 1973.

Oberschall, Anthony. Social Conflict and Social Movements. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973.

Parsons, Talcott. Sociological Theory and Modern Society. New York: Free Press, 1967.

_______. Structure and Process in Modern Societies. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1960.

_______. The Structure of Social Action. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1949.

Piaget, Jean. The Origins of Intelligence in Children. Trans. Margaret Cook. New York: Norton, 1963.

Rapoport, Anatol. "Conflict Resolution in the Light of Game Theory and Beyond." The Structure of Conflict. Ed. Paul Swingle. New York: The Academic Press, 1970, pp. 1-42.

Robbins, Stephen P. Managing Organizational Conflict: A Non-traditional Approach. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974.

Roethlisberger, Fritz J. Management and Morale. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1941.

Rogers, Carl R. Freedom to Learn; A View of What Education Might Become. Columbus, Ohio: C.E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1969.

_______. On Becoming a Person; A Therapist's View of Psychotherapy. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961.

Rubin, Jeffery Z., and Bert R. Brown. The Social Psychology of Bargaining and Negotiation. New York: Academic Press, 1975.

Schelling, Thomas C. The Strategy of Conflict. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966.

Scott, William G. The Management of Conflict: Appeal Systems in Organizations. Homewood, Illinois: Richard Irwin, 1965.

Silberman, Charles. *Crisis in the Classroom; the Remaking of American Education*. New York: Random House, 1970.

Simmel, Georg. *Conflict and the Web of Group Affiliation*. Trans. Kurt H. Wolff. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1955.

Smith, Clagett G., ed. *Conflict Resolution: Contributions of the Behavioral Sciences*. South Bend, Indiana; Notre Dame Press, 1971.

Swingle, Paul, ed. *The Structure of Conflict*. New York: The Academic Press, 1970.

Thomas, John, and Warren Bennis. *The Management of Change and Conflict*. Baltimore: Penguin Books, Inc., 1972.

Trusty, Francis M., ed. *Administering Human Resources: A Behavioral Approach to Educational Administration*. California: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1971, pp. 260-67; pp. 314-33.

Turner, Jonathan H. *The Structure of Sociological Theory*. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press, 1974.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. *Racial Isolation in the Public Schools*, Vol. 1. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

Walton, Richard E. *Interpersonal Peacemaking: Confrontations and Third Party Consultation*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969.

Warner, William Lloyd, and Associates. *Democracy in Jonesville: A Study in Equality and Inequality*. New York: Harper, 1949.

Warner, William Lloyd, and J.O. Lowe. *The Social Systems of the Modern Factory*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1947.

Weldon, Lynn L. *Conflicts in Our Schools*. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1971.

Whitehead, Alfred North. *The Aims of Education and Other Essays*. New York: Free Press, 1967.

Periodicals

Apple, Michael W. "The Hidden Curriculum and the Nature of Conflict," Interchange, Vol. 2, No. 4 (1971), pp. 27-40.

Bailey, Stephen. "Preparing Administrators for Conflict Resolution," Educational Record, Vol. 52, No. 3 (Summer, 1971), pp. 233-9.

Beck, Don. "Communication Through Confrontation: A Case Study in Inter-Group Conflict Resolution," Texas Personnel and Guidance Association Journal, Vol. 2, No. 1 (March, 1973), pp. 11-22.

Beck, E.M. "Conflict, Change, and Stability: A Reciprocal Interaction in Schools," Social Forces, Vol. 52, No. 4 (June, 1974), pp. 517-31.

Brown, Judson S. "Principles of Intra-personal Conflict," The Journal of Conflict Resolution, Vol. 1, No. 2 (1957-58), pp. 135-54.

Bryant, Bunyan E., Mark A. Chesler, and James E. Crowfoot. "Barometers of Conflict," Educational Leadership, Vol. 33, No. 1 (October, 1975), pp. 17-20.

Dahrendorf, Ralf. "Out of Utopia: Toward a Reorientation of Sociological Analysis," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 64, No. 2 (September, 1958), pp. 155-27.

________. "Toward a Theory of Social Conflict," The Journal of Conflict Resolution, Vol. 2, No. 2 (June, 1958), pp. 170-83.

Derr, C. Brooklyn. "Conflict Resolution in Organizations: Views From the Field of Educational Administration," Public Administration Review, No. 5 (September-October, 1972), pp. 495-501.

Deutsch, Morton, and others. "Strategies for Inducing Cooperation: An Experimental Study," Journal of Conflict Resolution, Vol. 11, No. 3 (September, 1967), pp. 345-60.

Horowitz, Irving Louis. "Consensus, Conflict and Cooperation: A Sociological Inventory," Social Forces, Vol. 41, No. 2 (December, 1962), pp. 177-88.

Lewin, Kurt. "Action Research and Minority Problems," Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 2, No. 4 (November, 1946), pp. 34-46.

Mack, Raymond W., and Richard C. Snyder. "The Analysis of Social Conflict Toward an Overview and Synthesis," Journal of Conflict Resolution, Vol. 1, No. 2 (June, 1957), pp. 212-48.

Maslow, A.H. "A Theory of Human Motivation," Psychological Review, Vol. 50, No. 4 (July, 1943), pp. 370-96.

Parsons, Talcott. "Social Classes and Class Conflict in the Light of Recent Sociological Theory," *American Economic Review*, Vol. 39, No. 3 (May, 1949), pp. 16-36.

Phenix, Philip H. "Values in the Emerging American Civilization," *Teachers College Record*, Vol. 61, No. 7 (April, 1960), pp. 355-66.

Phi Delta Kappa, Vol. 59, No. 5 (January, 1978), pp. 298-375. Special Issue: The Problems of Discipline and Violence in American Education.

Pondy, L.R. "Organizational Conflict: Concepts and Models," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 12, No 2 (September, 1967), pp. 296-320.

Rogers, Carl R. "Toward a Modern Approach to Values: The Valuing Process in the Mature Person," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, Vol. 68, No 2 (February, 1964), pp. 160-67.

Rogers, Carl R., and F.J. Roethlisberger. "Barriers and Gateways to Communication," *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 30, No. 4 (July-August, 1952), pp. 46-52.

Rothstein, Stanley William. "Conflict Resolution in a Supportive Environment," *Education and Urban Society*, Vol. 7, No 2 (February, 1975), pp. 193-206.

Selznick, Philip. "Foundations of the Theory of Organization," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 13, No 1 (February, 1948), pp. 25-35.

Trusty, Francis M. "Approaches to the Management of Conflict," *The New Era, Journal of the World Education Fellowship*, Vol. 58, No. 4 (July-August, 1977), pp. 92-8.

________. "An Exploration of Conflict and Conflict Management" (A report of an initial study of conflict and conflict management available through the ERIC system), May, 1976. Mimeographed.

APPENDIX A

Data previously collected from interviews with the following people were analyzed as a means of better understanding school related conflicts and developing strategies for managing these conflicts more effectively.

Dr. George Alexander, Prof.
Stanford University
Political Science, Bldg. 160
Stanford, CA 94305

Dr. Greg Anrig
State Commissioner of Education
State of Massachusetts
178 Tremont Street
Boston, MA

Dr. Chris Argyris, Prof.
School of Education
Gutman Library, Room 445
Harvard University
Cambridge, MA 02138

Dr. Robert I. Ayling
U.S. Dept. of Agriculture
#35295
14th and Independence
Washington, DC

Dr. James Bailey
Denver Public Schools
900 Grant Street
Denver, CO 80203

Dr. George Barron, Prof. & Head
Educational Admin. Department
University of London
Room 365, Malet Street
London, England WC1E7HS

Dr. Arthur Blumberg, Prof.
Syracuse University
103 Waverly Avenue
Syracuse, NY 13210

Dr. Kenneth Boulding, Prof.
Inst. of Behavioral Science
LBS3 102A Bldg. #3
Boulder, CO 80309

Dr. Con Briner
Claremont Grad. School
211 Harper Hall
Claremont, CA

Mr. Alan Brown, Acting Director
of Studies
Institute for Study of Conflict
17 N. Umberland Avenue
London, England WC2N 5BJ

Dr. Coby Bunch
5100 Highbridge St. Apt. 12C
Syracuse, NY 13066

Mr. Ellsworth Bunker
Ambassador At Large
Dept. of State, Room 7260
Washington, DC 20520

Mr. John W. Burton
Faculty of Laws
University College - London
4-8 Endsleigh Gardens
London, England WCIH OEG

Mr. Peter Carr, Director
Industrial Relations
Adv. Council, & Arbit. Service
Cleland House, Page Street
London, England W1P4ND

Dr. Michael Cohen
Inst. for Public Policy Studies
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, MI 48104

Dr. Robert Cohen
Denver Public Schools
900 Grant Street
Denver, CO 80203

Mr. Tom Colosi
American Arbitration Assoc.
1214 16th Street
Washington, DC 20036

Dr. Lewis A. Coser
Clare Hall, #18
Cambridge University
Cambridge, England CB39AL

Dr. Luverne Cunningham, Exec. Dir.
San Francisco Public Sch. Comm.
785 Market St., Bank of America
Bldg. Room 902
San Francisco, CA 95814

Dr. Stephen W. Daeschner, Dir.
Div. of Evaluation and Research
St. Louis Public Schools
1517 S. Theresa
St. Louis, MO 63104

Mr. Bill Dalton
26 South Avenue
Queens Park
Brighton, England

Dr. Lee Danielson, Prof.
University of Michigan
School of Business Admin.
Ann Arbor, MI 48104

Dr. Robert DeBlauw
St. Louis Public Schools
1517 S. Theresa
St. Louis, MO 63104

Dr. A.B.S. DeReuck, Research
Fellow in Internat'l Relations
University of Surrey
Guildford, Surrey England

Dr. Morton Deutsch, Prof.
Columbia University
Teachers College
525 W. 120th Street
New York, NY 10027

Mr. Robert Donahue
Director of Implementation
Boston Public Schools
26 Court Street
Boston, MA

Dr. John Ellis, Supt.
Columbus Public Schools
270 E. State Street
Columbus, OH 43215

Dr. Paul Fawley
University of Utah
Milton-Bennison Hall
Salt Lake City, UT

Ms. Ann Foley
Admin. Asst. to Supt.
Boston Public Schools
26 Court Street
Boston, MA

Dr. William Gamson, Chairperson
University of Michigan
Sociology Department
3040 LSA Building
Ann Arbor, MI 48104

Mr. Ron Glatter, Lecturer
University of London
Institute of Education
Room 371, Malet Street
London, England WC1#7HS

Dr. Herman Goldberg
Assoc. Commissioner of Educ.
U.S. Office of Education
400 Maryland Ave. S.W.
Washington, DC 20202

Dr. Bernie Haake, Supt.
Fayetteville-Manlius Schools
107 Pleasant Street
Fayetteville, NY 13104

Mr. Charles Hall
Asst. Supt. of Business
Columbus Public Schools
270 E. State Street
Columbus, OH 43215

Dr. Jerome Harris, Dist. Supt.
Brooklyn District #13
34 Court Street, 10th Floor
Brooklyn, NY 11201

Chief Judge George Hart, Jr.
U.S. Court Bldg. #4335
3rd and Constitution Avenue
Washington, DC

Dr. Robert Hefner
University of Michigan
Dept. of Psychology
Ann Arbor, MI 48104

Dr. Charles Hermann, Prof.
Mershon Center
199 W. 10th Avenue
Columbus, OH 43201

Mr. J.M.M. Hill, Chairman
Applied Social Research Units
Tavastock Inst. of Human Rel.
120 Bellsize Lane NW3
London, England NW35BA

Mr. A.D. Howell
University of London
Institute of Education
Room 367, Malet Street
London, England WC1E7HS

Mr. John Izbecki
Education Correspondent
Daily Telegraph
135 Fleet Street
London, England

Mr. Richard Jenson, Dist. Supt.
Los Lomitas School District
1011 Altschul Avenue
Menlo Park, CA 94025

Mr. Phil Jordan, Adm. Coord.
Los Angeles Public Schools
Room A-217, 450 N. Grand Ave.
Los Angeles, CA

Dr. Robert L. Kahn, Prof.
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, MI 48104

Dr. Don Katz, Prof. Emeritus
University of Michigan
P.O. Box 1248, Room 5131
Ann Arbor, MI 48104

Dr. Harold Kellner
77 Pond Avenue, Apt. 1505
Brookline, MA 02146

Dr. William L. Kelly, Prof.
Georgetown University
Psychological Center
25th and N. Streets
Washington, DC 20007

Dr. Herbert C. Kelman, Prof.
Dept. of Psych. and Social Relations
William James Hall #1430
Harvard University
Cambridge, MA 02138

Dr. Steve Knezevich, Dean
College of Education
USC, #1101 Wade Phillips Hall
Los Angeles, CA 90007

Dr. Louis Kriesberg, Prof.
Syracuse University
Department of Sociology
500 University
Syracuse, NY 13210

Dr. James Laue
University of Missouri
Department of Sociology
St. Louis, MO 63121

Dr. Roy Lewicki
Amos Tuch School of Business
Dartmouth College
Hanover, NH 03755

Dr. Seymour Lipsett, Prof.
Stanford University
Room 233, Hoover, Inst. Annex
Political Science-Sociology
Stanford, CA 94305

Mr. Amos Lynch, Gen. Manager
Call & Post Newspaper
109 Hamilton Ave., Box 2606
Columbus, OH 43216

Ms. Donna Mahoney
Crises Center
Boston Public Schools
26 Court Street
Boston, MA

Dr. Lewis B. Mayhew, Prof.
Stanford University
College of Education
Room A-2, Education Bldg.
Stanford, CA 94305

Dr. Lloyd McCleary, Prof.
University of Utah
Milton-Bennison Hall
Salt Lake City, UT

Dr. Joe McPherson
Senior Behavioral Scientist
Stanford Research Institute
333 Ravenswood Avenue
Menlo Park, CA

Mr. Sal Micciche, Asst. to
Editor of Boston Globe
135 Morrissey Blvd.
Boston, MA 02107

Dr. Thomas Milburn, Prof.
Oxley Hall
1712 Neil Avenue
Columbus, OH 43210

Mr. Eric Miller
The Tavastock Inst. of Human
Relations - Tavastock Centre
120 Bellsize Lane NW3
London, England NW35BA

Dr. Michael Murphy
University of Utah
Milton Bennison Hall
Salt Lake City, UT

Miss Pat Murray, Director
Drug Program
Boston Public Schools
26 Court Street
Boston, MA 02108

Dr. George Nicolau, V.-Pres.
Inst. for Mediation & Conflict
Resolution
49 East, 68th Street
New York, NY 10021

Dr. Robert North
Stanford University
Political Science Dept. #180
Stanford, CA 94305

Mr. Bram Oppenheim
London School of Economics
Dept. of Social Psychology
London, England

Mr. Donald Parr, Supt.
Jordon School District
9861 South N.W.
Sandy, UT

Ms. Pat Pecorella
University of Michigan
5065 Inst. for Social Research
Box 1248
Ann Arbor, MI 48104

Dr. Richard Podemski
Univ. Council for Educ. Admin.
29 W. Woodruff Avenue
Columbus, OH 43210

Dr. Harry Randles
Syracuse University
Dept. of Educational Admin.
103 Waverly Avenue
Syracuse, NY 13210

Dr. Harold Rankin, Asst. Dean
Syracuse University
College of Education
103 Waverly Avenue
Syracuse, NY 13210

Dr. Edwin Read, Chairman
Educ. Admin. & Supv. Dept.
University of Utah
Milton-Bennion Hall
Salt Lake City, UT 84112

Dr. Charles Rehmus
University of Michigan
Institute for Labor Relations
Ann Arbor, MI 48104

Dr. Reed Richardson
University of Utah
Business Office, Room 221
Salt Lake City, UT

Dr. Robin Richardson
World Studies Project
37 Parliament Street
London, England SWI

Albert E. Roark
University of Colorado
Room 203, Education Bldg.
Boulder, CO

Dr. Carl Rogers, Res. Fellow
Center for Study of the Person
2311 Via Siena
La Jolla, CA 92037

Dr. John Rosemond, M.D.
1314 Mt. Vernon
Columbus, OH 43203

Dr. Paul Salmon, Exec. Dir.
American Assoc. of Sch. Admin.
1801 N. Moore Street
Arlington, VA 22209

Mr. Sandburg
American Embassy
24 Grosvenor Sq. W1
London, England

Dr. Gene Schwilck, President
Danforth Foundation
222 South Central Avenue
St. Louis, MO 63105

Dr. Pete Shannon, Asst. Supt.
Denver Public Schools
900 Grant Street
Denver, CO 80203

Dr. David Singer, Prof.
University of Michigan
Mental Health Research Inst.
Room 2012
Ann Arbor, MI 48104

Dr. Robert Simerly, Prof.
Bureau of School Service
Syracuse University
103 Waverly Avenue
Syracuse, NY 13210

Ms. Barbara Sizemore
1629 Columbia Rd., NW
Washington, DC 20011

Dr. Karl Stenmark, Deputy Supt.
Denver Public Schools
900 Grant Street
Denver, CO 80203

Dr. Don M. Thomas, Supt.
Salt Lake City Public Schools
440 E. 1st South
Salt Lake City, UT

Mrs. Beryl Tipton, Prof.
Dept. of Educ. Admin. & Supv.
University of London
Malet Street, Room 369
London, England WC1E7HS

Dr. Curtis Van Voorhees
University of Michigan
Dept. of Educational Admin.
Ann Arbor, MI 48104

Dr. Newman Walker, Supt.
Palo Alto Public Schools
4123 Wilkie Ct.
Palo Alto, CA

Dr. Paul Wehr, Assoc. Prof.
Inst. of Behavioral Science
University of Colorado
KTCH8C Building #1
Boulder, CO 80309

Mr. James Wetchel, Assoc. Advisor
Federal Reserve Board
2600 Virginia, NE #1001
Washington, DC 20511

Sgt. Barry Whalley
Oakland Police Department
455 7th Street, Room 900
Oakland, CA

Mr. Douglas Woodhouse, Dir.
Institute of Marital Studies
Tavastock Center
120 Bellsize Lane NW3
London, England NW34BA

Ms. D.J. Young, Edit. Asst.
Federal Mediation & Conciliation
  Service
Constitution Avenue & 14th Street
Washington, DC 20427

Dr. Gary Young, Assoc. Dir.
Southwest Community Mental
  Health Center
845 West Town Street
Columbus, OH 43222